

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXV

SEPTEMBER, 1932

No. 147

EDITORIAL

DR. EDWYN BEVAN ON CHRISTIANITY

It was indeed a happy inspiration which led to Dr. Bevan being entrusted with the volume in the Home University Library which was to be concerned with our religion; and he has given us in *Christianity** a volume which was well described in the *Church Times* as "a golden book." Alike in its scientific and judicial temper, its depth and detail of learning, its distinction of style, and its restrained but pervasive fervour, it ranks as one of the most remarkable books of our time. Literary critics of a century hence will, we think, look back to the present age as one that was marked by the appearance of books whose importance was out of all proportion to their length. Thus, Otto's *The Idea of the Holy*, Whitehead's *Religion in the Making*, Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' and Mr. Davey's *The Riddle of the New Testament*, Mr. Brabant's and Mr. Hartill's *Faith and Truth*—these are all books which say a great deal in a short space. They do so because they are books of decision, defining issues and stating first principles. But Dr. Bevan's is a greater masterpiece than these, in proportion to the immense variety of facts and opinions, of historical movements, of beliefs and practices, which form his subject-matter. And he has dealt with them not by the process of exclusion, but by a process of discriminating comprehension and of sympathetic criticism which makes the truth stand out large, but not vague, and rich, but not uncertain.

The first two chapters, entitled respectively "Origins" and "The Church among the Gentiles," are devoted to bringing out the *differentia* of the Christian religion—the central position of the Christ, who had died and was believed to have risen again; the uncompromising monotheism, which determined its attitude to the world and to the march of events; and the communal

* *Christianity*. By Edwyn Bevan. Home University Library. Thornton Butterworth. 2s. 6d. net.

character of the way of salvation it proclaimed. The following chapters lead us to the heart of the fundamental controversies of Christianity, on which Dr. Bevan shows himself unreservedly Catholic. Was the Christian religion so wholly "other" in its principles and ideals that it could and should come to no terms with the best pagan thought? The issue is still a live one: some of the best Protestant thought in Germany and Sweden today is concerned to isolate Christianity wholly from all entanglement with the immanent truth or goodness in the world around it. That Dr. Bevan does not share this view is shown by the examples of exalted ethical teaching which he quotes from Plato and Epicurus. What Christianity did was not so much to supersede the best standards of antiquity, as to show by the testimony of men's lives that Christianity brought them within the practical accomplishment of all believers.

Similar considerations underlie the defence of Christian dogma. When the Church inserted the *Homo-ousion* in the Creed, or approved the Tome of Leo, it was deliberately affirming the rights of reason in regard to religion, and that human philosophical terms were not improper garments in which to clothe the truths of the Christian Faith.

If (writes Dr. Bevan), when Christians said that God "so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son," they meant by God's Son a Created Being not one with Himself, even though it were a Being "similar in substance" to God, then the Cross might show a good man, or an incarnate Angel, enduring pain by his own heroic choice, but it could no longer show God's love. . . . The very heart of the Christian faith was involved in the controversy between Arius and Athanasius.

The soteriological emphasis in this passage is characteristic of much else in the book, not least of the striking pages at the end of Chapter IX., where Dr. Bevan writes of the close affinities between Catholics and the older Protestants in their devotion to the Cross. But the dogmatic formulations of the Councils are not only defensible as necessary at the time they were framed. They have also a perennial value. As Dr. Bevan says, in reply to those who would like to see the Creeds re-written:

The use of the old formula . . . allows a larger freedom of thought without a rupture of unity, since its phraseology, recognized as humanly inadequate, ties down less than a modern formula would, subscription to which would be construed as implying an exact agreement with the verbal statements (p. 95).

And in a later passage, dealing more directly with certain types of Modernism, he puts the point from the opposite angle:

What makes the proposal to have a modernized Christianity based upon the human Figure of Jesus alone, apart from "theological dogma," seem so plausible, is that the Figure has acquired a power of appeal, as embodying the supreme ideal of self-sacrificing love, just because the belief of the Church in regard to Jesus was presupposed. . . . But if the ground on which that suggestion, that halo, became first attached to the name is gone, the glamour sooner or later must fade, and men must recognize the truth in the light of common day—that at the source of Christianity in Palestine there was a very remarkable and attractive personality of some kind, but that all imaginative reconstructions of that personality based upon our fragmentary data must be highly conjectural.

In discussing the Reformation, Dr. Bevan's judicial mind is seen at its best, for the material would seem almost to forbid such treatment. Perhaps we shall not be wrong if we say that none but an Anglican could have written this chapter, and that it embodies to a remarkable degree the reaction of the Church of England to those turbid times. Yet Dr. Bevan never relinquishes his independence: particularly significant is his defence of the Invocation of Saints:

It is possible to allow that to ask the intercession of saints is in itself nothing irreconcilable with New Testament religion, and yet to hold that the worship of saints in popular Catholicism has in practice often differed little from polytheism (p. 163, and cf. footnote there).

And there is a fine appreciation of Luther:

It may still be true that his religious genius made him detect, below the particular abuses of contemporary Catholicism, what was profoundly wrong in its attitude to God. Further, there was something about this big, imperfect man of such a kind that what he felt shook the hearts of thousands in Europe, broke up the court of existing kings, and changed the face of the world (p. 170).

Enough has been said, perhaps, to whet the appetite of the reader for the book itself; and the reviewer of such a volume can do little more. Here and there, naturally, a criticism or a query will suggest itself. When it is said, for instance, that "all the Christianity which was in future centuries to count as an important factor in the world, was developed from the Christianity of the Latin West," we cannot help asking whether justice is done to the last centuries of the Eastern Empire, or to the mission-work of the Russian Church in more recent times in Asia and the Far East. But such points of possible criticism, even if they were more numerous than they are, will in no way abate the reader's admiration for a book that is so helpful at every turn, or his sense of gratitude to the man who wrote it.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CONVERSION (II.)

III. THE CONVERSION PROCESS

THE conversional process may now be more fully elucidated. It is the present fashion to do so in terms of complexes. The human psyche functions as a play of forces (the origin and nature of which are perhaps not known to psychology), and its development is through the formation of psychic systems or complexes: no one experience is isolated: the psychic unit is a system or complex made up of representational, affective, and motor elements, and experience is the progressive organization of these systems into a unified and unitary character. This process, however, necessarily involves struggle. Rival systems compete for supremacy, opposing systems engage in conflict—from time to time some systems or complexes are overthrown and temporarily disappear into the limbo of the unconscious. But though overthrown and dormant they are never wholly impotent, and in conversion systems are reborn and readjusted. A repressed complex is ever tending to re-emerge, and should the dominant complex reach the limits of its own power it may in its turn be overthrown by the sudden irruption of a complex repressed. Thus the conversion of St. Paul may be interpreted as a conflict between a Pharisee-complex well organized, of long standing and possessing all the power of a vested interest, and a Christ-complex, a later arrival, at first hesitant, but possessing all the growing virility of youth. The vested-interest of the older complex is powerful enough to repress the newer, but repression does not destroy the power of the new-born complex, and feverish activity and persecution is but the outward manifestation of the secret interior conflict. The state of tension thus engendered could not with safety continue, sooner or later room must be found for the Christ-complex, and an explosive change occurs in which the imprisoned psychic system at last emerges triumphant to give a new direction to the whole man, a complete rearrangement of values, and restoration and equilibrium to the soul.

Much the same process would seem to have occurred in the conversion from idolatry to monotheism of Dayananda Saraswati. The founder of the Arya Samaj had been brought up in a Hindu home; his religious environment was polytheistic, but he had often heard of the monotheistic teachings of the Sthanakavasi Jains. For a while the immature monotheism-complex would be repressed and controlled by the polytheism-complex of his early training. One night, in his fourteenth

year, he was taken by his father to a Hindu festival. While other worshippers fell asleep, Saraswati, who had kept awake by bathing his eyes in water, observed a mouse consuming the offering spread before the lingam, and further running with impunity over the sacred image. That such desecration could occur without disaster overtaking the mouse filled his mind with doubts which his father could not allay. The repressed monotheism-complex, thus strengthened, re-emerged; he broke the fast, severed himself from polytheism, and began his lifelong campaign against idolatry. Here, too, then, we see opposed complexes engaged in conflict reaching a point at which one or other must be finally vanquished and its energy released towards new values, and the crisis precipitated by some relatively trifling outward event.*

In the case of St. Augustine the conflict arises between what may be called his God-consciousness and his sex-complex, but whereas in St. Paul the rival complex seems at first to have been successfully repressed into the unconscious, in St. Augustine both complexes seem to have been equally present and co-ordinately focal in consciousness. Voluntary choice based upon prolonged consideration seems to have lifted one of these complexes to a finally dominant position, whereas in St. Paul unification appears to have been occasioned by the sudden uprising of the buried complex. In every case, however, the conversion involves the complete and integral overturning of consciousness. De Sanctis points out that sometimes a spurious or perhaps one should say a preliminary or trial conversion occurs which, however, has not the real characteristic of complete transformation of values. Thus Louise de la Vallière experienced a first conversional crisis, the result of a passing shock, ten years before the real and genuine conversion occurred, and she was therefore rejected by the Mother Superior of the Convent of Chaillot when she tried to become a novice on the first occasion. Conversions due to pique are always suspect.

But there are cases where the conflict is not resolved by active volition and triumphant effort, but by the withdrawal of all effort. Strenuous effort in such cases, says James, "only makes them twofold more the children of hell than they were before." But so soon as effort is relaxed the suggestion of possible defeat languishes, and the dominant suggestion comes to be one of the Divine assistance achieving what the individual was powerless himself to effect. In Protestant Christianity the efficacy of effortless surrender, the passive reliance upon the saving help of Christ, is perhaps more marked than in cases of Catholic conversions, but it is Bishop Gore who says "Act

* Cp. Selwyn : *Approach to Christianity*, ch. ii.

against sin, in Christ's name, as if you had strength, and you will find you have."

It is not only in the case of great sinners that passive acquiescence in the operation of grace is effective, it is equally fruitful in releasing victims of great fear from their distress. Bunyan was for long obsessed with the fear of eternal damnation and the dread that he might fall into unforgivable sin. But so soon as he ceased to strive, had abandoned the idea that he *could* strive and could succeed alone, the sense of assurance came forthwith. In *Grace Abounding** he says that he was one day walking in a field still pursued by the dread that he might sin unforgivably when "suddenly this sentence fell on my soul, 'Thy righteousness is in heaven!' And methought I saw with the eyes of my soul Jesus Christ at God's right hand; there, I say, was my righteousness; so that wherever I was or whatever I was doing, God could not say of me, He wants my righteousness, for that was just before Him. I also saw, moreover, that it was not my good frame of heart that made my righteousness better, nor yet my bad frame that made my righteousness worse; for my righteousness was Jesus Christ Himself. Now did my chains fall off my legs indeed; I was loosened from my afflictions and irons; my temptations also fled away; so that from that time those dreadful scriptures of God left off to trouble me; now went I also home rejoicing." Romans vii. describes Paul's similar experience of peace ensuing immediately after the relaxation of effort.

There are, however, conversions which differ materially from those hitherto discussed. They are cases in which there is no violent conflict between two complexes, one dominant and the other repressed, and no sliding into peace through the relaxation of all effort, but rather they are cases of progressive or precipitated illumination of obscure and ill-defined complexes. Thus the first great renunciation in the case of the Buddha in which he abandoned all home ties and went forth as a wanderer was not in itself the definitive conversion. Seven years of ceaseless search in differing schools of thought followed, seven years of intellectual perplexities. During this period his system of thought would seem to have become gradually clarified, but final release from "the intoxication of ignorance," final illumination came at last suddenly in one great moment of illumination as he sat under a peepul-tree. Rhys Davids quotes as follows (from the *Maha-saccaka*): "When this knowledge, this insight, had arisen within me, my heart was set free from the intoxication of lusts, set free from the intoxication of becomings, set free from the intoxication of ignorance. In me, thus emancipated,

there arose the certainty of that emancipation. And I came to know, 'Rebirth is at an end. The higher life has been fulfilled. What had to be done has been accomplished. After this present life there will be no beyond.' This last insight did I attain in the last watch of the night. Ignorance was beaten down, insight arose, darkness was destroyed, the light came inasmuch as I was there, strenuous, aglow, and master of myself."*

The conversion of St. Ignatius included a similar long and equally intense period of incubation culminating in the ten months' interior preparation in the Cave of Manresa, where at length "the thick fog of scrupulosity drew off as suddenly as it had come, and with it went his miseries."† In like manner Charles de Foucauld, after twelve years of intellectual infidelity but not of gross sin, received an illumination which led him quietly to obey the Abbé Huvelin's command, "Confess: communicate"; from that day forth he knew no doubts, accepted his vocation, became the Hermit of the Sahara.

But although conversions always involve the rebirth, illumination, or substitution of the religious complex, the decisive moment is not in those processes which are often unconscious and even semi-automatic. The decisive moment lies "in the acceptance of the complex on the part of the convert, and in the solution which the now reborn or renewed complex offers to the problem of individual happiness for the present and the future." It is this acceptance of the complex which gives to the convert the sense of novelty, of new power, new joy, new peace. He experiences a sense of complete renewal, of reintegration of personality. It is not necessary that this sense of renewal should be one of excited fervour; there may be intellectual rather than emotional intensity. Generally speaking, however, the affective element must be strong enough to impart stability and reinforcement to the volitional and intellectual. Hence, says de Sanctis, "while not all true converts are exceptionally intelligent, they certainly have all been passionate souls." Newman was a great intellectual force, but he was also a man of ardent sensibilities, a creator of beautiful prose and beautiful poetry. His early resolution to celibacy enabled the ardour of his passionate nature to be transferred to religion and theology. For a while Pusey and his wife also secured much of his affection, but after the death of Mrs. Pusey Newman's estrangement from Pusey himself increased; he needed an object for his affection, the Church of England failed to satisfy his needs; he wrote to Manning, "I love the Church of Rome too well," and to that Church he was converted. Hence

* *Early Buddhism*, 86. Rhys Davids.

† Francis Thompson on Ignatius Loyola, p. 24.

his conversion has been described as a love story. On the other hand, Pusey's continued attachment to the Church of England was intensified by his wife's death, and to her Church he remained loyal. De Sanctis' interpretation of the cases of Newman and Pusey seems to me precarious: he forgets that Manning was a widower like Pusey; yet while Pusey remained an Anglican, Manning went over, although his devotion to his dead wife was not less profound than Pusey's.

It is a fact, however, that the transference of emotion in conversion is so conspicuous that most writers agree in regarding conversion as generally involving the sublimation of the sex impulses. The affective psychic energy of the convert is displaced, is unconsciously transferred in another direction and concentrated upon the object of faith. There thus occurs a revision or new economy of love. Sublimation may reach the heroic level of renunciation expressed in poverty and consecrated continence, nevertheless the convert remains what he was before, a lover, only he becomes a great lover. He alters his route, he does not change his nature. The process of sublimation involves constant struggle, and although often unconscious it may be and often is conscious and voluntary. In adolescent sublimations obstacles frequently produce reversions after conversion, nevertheless "there is no vice that conversion cannot cure." Sublimation often means voluntary mental sterilization or inoculation.

Those writers who lay great stress on the sublimation of the passions in and after conversion seem to me, however, to err in their further suggestion that adolescence, and adolescence alone, is the fertile period of conversion. Ignatius Loyola was thirty before he was converted, St. Catherine of Genoa a middle-aged wife before she cried out, "No more sins, no more world!" It has even been said that conversions are rare or unknown in old age or middle age. Yet Newman was forty-four before he entered upon his "second spring." It does not seem to me accurate or wise to regard conversion as a phenomenon characteristic only of adolescence and immaturity. The intellectual conversion so powerfully described in Wordsworth's *Prelude* was not a mark of immaturity—he was twenty-five years of age when he for a time "yielded up moral questions in despair"; he was a grown man familiar with the political philosophy of his day and already dissatisfied with the academic and ecclesiastical institutions of his time when the Terror of 1793 shook not merely his intellectual convictions but every fibre of his being, intellectual, moral, æsthetic, and spiritual. It is indeed not a little strange that English and American psychologists have ignored Wordsworth's *Prelude* as a *locus classicus* for

the psychology of conversion. In Books X. and XI. he describes with the utmost precision the course of his own spiritual crisis. Everything postulated by James as constitutive of the process of conversion enters into Wordsworth's own case. Under the stress of the (to him) unjust war by England against the new-found liberties of France, his faith in justice was first shaken; under the greater stress produced by the revolutionary excesses and abuse of liberty that faith was further weakened—his personality became discordant and unhappy, signally illustrating that feature of suffering which some authorities regard as essential if the process of conversion is to reach its climax. The thwarting of his projected alliance with Annette Vallon intensified his suffering. Like the Buddha he sought relief in various philosophic systems, but in vain. The pursuit of abstract science was no more helpful in bringing peace. The strain became unendurable, and the only way of escape lay in a "sudden admonition" of which his sister was a vehicle, calling upon him to surrender to the unconscious vocation prescribed for him five years before, to be a dedicated spirit. The new integration of values thus obtained through the new illumination and surrender, the definite acceptance of his vocation, gave him thereafter peace, serenity, the deep power of joy and a perception of unity in the visible and invisible Great Society. He was little more than seventeen when the first unconscious stage in his conversion was reached; he had passed a night in "dancing, gaiety and mirth"; his path homeward led through an open field, and there—

"Magnificent

The morning rose, in memorable pomp,
Glorious as e'er I had beheld—in front,
The sea lay laughing at a distance; near
The solid mountains shone, bright as the clouds,
Grain tintured, drenched in empyrean light;
And in the meadows and the lower grounds
Was all the sweetness of a common dawn—
Dews, vapours, and the melody of birds,
And labourers going forth to till the fields.
Ah, need I say, dear Friend! that to the brim
My heart was full: I made no vows, but vows
Were then made for me: bond unknown to me
Was given that I should be, else sinning greatly,
A dedicated Spirit."

But five years later it was a divided self which sought to re-establish its lost harmony:

"So I fared,

Dragging all precepts, judgments, maxims, creeds,
Like culprits to the bar; calling the mind
Suspiciously, to establish in plain day
Her titles and her honours; now believing,

Now disbelieving; endlessly perplexed
 With impulse, motive, right and wrong, the ground
 Of obligation, what the rule and whence
 The sanction; till demanding formal *proof*,
 And seeking it in everything, I lost
 All feeling of conviction, and in fine,
 Sick, wearied out with contrarities,
 Yielded up moral questions in despair.
 This was the crisis of that strong disease,
 This the soul's last and lowest ebb; I drooped."

A further period of spiritual incubation passed and then deliverance came, mediated by his sister:

"Then it was—
 Thanks to the bounteous Giver of all good!—
 That the beloved Sister in whose sight
 Those days were passed, now speaking in a voice
 Of sudden admonition . . .
 Maintained for me a saving intercourse
 With my true self . . .
 She whispered still that brightness would return,
 She, in the midst of all, preserved me still,
 A Poet, bade me seek beneath that name
 And that alone, my office upon earth."

Out of the acquiescence in and surrender to the vocation which had in earlier years been prescribed, but all unknown to him, came the intuition which enabled his distracted soul at last to find peace.

"There is
 One great Society alone on earth:
 The noble Living and the noble Dead."

It is hardly necessary to add that Francis Thompson's *Hound of Heaven* is an equally intimate record of the process of conversion, culminating in the act of surrender and in that act attaining peace and integration of soul.

"All which thy child's mistake
 Fancies as lost, I have stored for thee at home:
 Rise, clasp My hand, and come!
 Halts by me that footfall:
 Is my gloom, after all,
 Shade of His hand outstretched caressingly?
 Ah! fondest, blindest, weakest,
 I am He Whom thou seekest!
 Thou dravest Love from thee, who dravest Me."

IV. THE PREDICTABILITY OF CONVERSION

I have referred more particularly to these two great cases of conversion in the ranks of the poets because I find myself unable to agree with the suggestion that conversion is most fully explained on biological and sexual grounds. Every conversion may be described as a love story, but not necessarily as a sex story, and not necessarily as a story of frustrated love and sublimated passion. But, as has been well said, "The theoretical conception of a sexual life existing apart from control, more or less effective, by the public opinion of the community, is unreal, incompatible with human nature, never realized."* And I must agree with Mr. Charles Fox when he writes that "any account of human conduct that regards our physiological organism as the determiner of our acts ignores the essential factor of what is socially given."† This has an important bearing upon the alleged predictability of conversion, a brief reference to which must bring this paper to a close.

Religious conversion is admittedly a long and complicated process in which the whole personality "undergoes a complete mutation."‡ It exhibits periods of adjustment, adaptation, oscillation, but it finally closes in a permanent and new equipoise of thought and feeling. The subject is not unaware of the mutation process. The conversion is lived, and lived through, not solely in the unconscious, and not solely imposed from without. It is not really an abnormal process, but normal in the psychic evolutions of the individual and not necessarily morbid in any of its details. But de Sanctis goes further than this and suggests that psychological prediction, though relative, is possible and that from the actual and visible signs of the conversional process the final conversion, the final self-surrender may be foreseen and foretold. The individual situation, he avers, though variable, "may be foreseen, because it is, at bottom, an actuality and can therefore be seen by those who are capable of seeing it." He therefore enumerates six conducive factors, which being present in any one individual enable a conversion to be predicted with some certainty, and he affirms that the propaganda of missions throughout the ages is based upon these six conditions. They are (i.) the presence of general religious tendencies inherited or acquired in infancy and childhood, during the period of greatest plasticity. (ii.) An habitual tendency of the intellect towards absolute convictions, positive or

* Margold: *Sex Freedom and Social Control*.

† Fox: *The Mind and its Body*, 185.

‡ de Sanctis, 252.

negative—*i.e.*, the absence, on the whole, of a critical attitude. (iii.) A tendency of the individual to fix his attention beyond and above the realities of sense; a tendency to contemplation, renunciation, and mysticism. (iv.) A rich affective life, the nature and extent of which can be ascertained by trained observation of the behaviour and attitude of the subject or by the technique of psycho-analysis. In great converts such as St. Paul and St. Augustine, the degree of affective potential amounts to what we call genius. This state of rich affectiveness is itself conditioned by the endocrine glands, and, says de Sanctis, "the endocrine formula most favourable to radical mutations in life and thought is the hyperthyroid — hyperpituitary — hyper-genital — hypo-adrenal"! (v.) The existence of displacements or temporary transfers of affective force from various systems or complexes to those which are akin to the religious; in short, a persistent tendency in the individual to transfer his interests to questions of origin, purpose, destiny, etc. This is hardly compatible, we may note, with the second tendency, which is described as the antithesis of the critical attitude. (vi.) Lastly, the recurrence of painful experiences which are the more important in proportion as their external reactions are deeper and less visible.

Given the concurrence of these six "situations" we may expect powerful volitional processes to occur as will bring about the final mutation of values and reintegration of a divided self. I cannot myself think, however, that conversion is only a matter of the rearrangement of complexes, and the volitional surrender even de Sanctis admits is least amenable to prediction. What part is played in conversion by something given, grace *vouchsafed*, it seems to me must be for ever hid from psychology proper. That man's co-operation is necessary we must agree, that the readiness is all we cannot agree. The Divine contribution is *vouchsafed* or withheld. Withheld, the would-be convert remains distraught; *vouchsafed*, the would-be convert is healed. And if it be true, as Mr. Fox* says, that "no act can be predicted from a man's biological constitution, but that the content and form of every human activity is essentially social," I would add that it is not less true that no act can be wholly predicted from a man's psychological constitution. Conversion is neither a wholly private nor a wholly social affair; it belongs to the soul's commerce with her Maker, to whom alone it pertains to *vouchsafe* or withhold His saving grace. The operations of that grace are not within the purview of psychology nor within the scope of science. The would-be convert may both consciously and unconsciously prepare for the visitations of that grace, but he cannot compel it, he can only beseech:

* Fox, *op. cit.*, 186.

"This sanctuary of my soul
Unwitting I keep white and whole,
Unlatched and lit, if Thou shouldst care
To enter or to tarry there.

"With parted lips and outstretched hands
And listening ears Thy servant stands,
Call Thou early, call Thou late,
To Thy great service dedicate."*

ALBERT A. COCK.

MODERN DARWINISM†

It is a common reproach against Christianity that the term Christianity includes a fine confused variety of conflicting views. Whatever justification there may be for this criticism, the same point might be made with far greater effect against Darwinism. Professor J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S., for instance, the latest champion of Darwinism, is clearly inspired more by *pietas*, by a reverence for Darwin's memory, than by any lively faith in the possibility of salving any substantial part of Darwin's theories from the wreck.

Professor Haldane reminds me of those extreme modernists who insist on describing themselves as Christians, and who apparently believe that Christ was slightly more divine than Bishop Barnes, but considerably less enlightened. Now the essence of Christianity is the belief that Christ was God, and the essence of Darwinism is the belief that Natural Selection does the work of God. Darwin believed that the appearance of design in Nature should be attributed, not to intelligence, but to chance. Nothing could permanently shake his firm faith in the *all-sufficiency* of Natural Selection to produce new forms. . . . Natural Selection, Darwin argued, may be said to create new species out of fortuitous variations as truly as a man may be said to create a building out of stones of various shapes. Darwinism is important in the history of thought because Darwin was deemed to have refuted Paley. Paley argued that it would be as plausible to believe that a watch was a chance aggregation of matter as to contend that the eye, as exquisitely adapted as the watch to the purpose for which it was intended, owed its existence to pure chance. The thought of the human eye made Darwin feel sick, as he himself confessed, but he contrived to fit the eye into his scheme and to maintain unshaken his faith

* C. H. Sorley.

† *The Causes of Evolution*. By J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S. Longmans, Green and Co.

in the all-sufficiency of Natural Selection to explain every form of life.

Modern apologists for Darwin seem to be content to prove what nobody would be interested to deny, that Natural Selection has *some* influence on the development of species. But that is not the point. Darwinism completely fails the atheist unless Natural Selection can be proved to be the *sole* agent of evolution. Admit the least hint of design and purpose, and Paley's argument is unanswerable, as indeed the more clear-sighted champions of Darwin fully realize.

"Whoever does not place all activity wholesale under the sway of Epicurean chance, whoever gives only his little finger to teleology, will inevitably arrive at Paley's discarded 'Natural Theology,' and so much the more necessarily, the more clearly he thinks and the more independent his judgment. . . . The possibility, ever so distant, of banishing from nature its seeming purpose, and putting a blind necessity everywhere in the place of final causes, appears, therefore, as one of the greatest advances in the world of thought, from which a new era will be dated in the treatment of these problems. To have somewhat eased the torture of the intellect which ponders over the world-problem will, as long as philosophical naturalists exist, be Charles Darwin's greatest title to glory."*

If to be a great misleader is a title to glory, Darwin is assured of his niche in the temple of scientific fame.

Professor Haldane, the latest and perhaps the most brilliant champion of neo-Darwinism, frankly abandons the attempt to prove the all-sufficiency of Natural Selection. He opens his book with a fake quotation: "'Darwinism is dead'—*Any Sermon.*"

"He might as well," as Mr. Heseltine remarks in a brilliant article (*English Review*, July, 1932), "have attributed the words to Nilsson, Bateson, Korchinsky, Dennert, Dwight, Morgan, Le Dantec, Driesch, Hartmann, Kassowitz Eimer—but why go on? It would be as true to say 'Any Scientist.'"

Professor Haldane tells us that five explanations have been advanced to explain the "deeper transformations" of the geological record, all of which, he seems to think, have been operative in a greater or lesser degree. Natural Selection is *only one* of these causes.

The main impression left from Professor Haldane's book is that this brilliant biologist is to all intents and purposes an agnostic on the subject of Darwinism, and is very much puzzled by the inconsistencies in the evidence for evolution itself. "The story of the Ammonites," he writes, "is not very easy to recon-

* Du Bois-Raymond.

cile with evolution by natural selection. . . . Further observation of these marine races showing slow continuous evolution displayed an extraordinary group of phenomena which are not obviously explicable on any theory of evolution whatever. . . . One is left with the impression that the evolutionary process somehow acquired a momentum which took it past the point at which it would have ceased on a basis of utility." How unlike Darwinian evolution, which never acquired momentum, but which, like a slow-witted apprentice, slowly and conscientiously collected minute and fortuitous variations.

But, alas! nothing is left of that Darwinian evolution which, one feels, was qualified to serve as patron saint of a Mutual Improvement Society. "Most evolutionary changes are degenerate," says Professor Haldane sadly. "The histories of progress are exceptional," he adds with a tear. "Evolution," he concludes gloomily, "does not point to any general tendency of species to progress." Now all this is really very wistful. I could hardly bear to continue reading. I, too, had been brought up to believe in a nice, orderly, progressive evolution, broadening out, as Tennyson so beautifully said, from precedent to precedent. Indeed, the pages of Professor Haldane's book are fragrant with Victorian memories, with the ghost of that dear old-fashioned evolution which was the inspiration of ethical societies, evolution with its gospel of inevitable progress. Why, we had an example of it before our very eyes. Not only has the British Parliament, that model of all the virtues, evolved from humble beginnings, but the inferior races were beginning to model their legislatures on ours. All of which, as Tennyson has so beautifully observed, would eventually, under the influence of evolution, evolve into the Parliament of man. Which it has—at Geneva—and this is perhaps why Professor Haldane gloomily concludes: "The usual course taken by an evolving line has been one of degeneration. It seems to me altogether probable that man will take this course unless he takes conscious control of his evolution within the next few thousand years." And again: "The facts of variation, though different from what Darwin believed them to be, are yet such as to yield a raw material on which Natural Selection can work. . . . But we know very little about what is actually selected, and any attempt to give a concrete account of Natural Selection at work must be decidedly speculative."

In other words, all that remains are the blessed words "Natural Selection." So long as we can continue to "faintly trust the larger hope"—it is impossible to stop quoting Tennyson in this discussion of the great Victorian heresy—so long as we can prove that Natural Selection does occasionally select something, it doesn't much matter what, nor does it much matter

with what effect, so long as we can maintain with undiminished faith that the fittest to survive actually succeed in surviving, we can still describe ourselves as Darwinians and can still refer contemptuously to "any sermon" which asserts that Darwinism is dead. "The first five chapters of this book," writes Professor Haldane, "have served, I hope, to reveal the depths of our ignorance." They have indeed. When Professor Haldane says, "But they do also reveal the fact that our ignorance is diminishing," we can say appreciably more about evolution today than was possible ten years ago: "I suggest that it would be truer to say that our ignorance is only diminishing in the sense that we are at last beginning to realize our ignorance. We may know more, but we certainly profess to know far less. The old confident dogmatism is disappearing, and scientists are beginning to realize that the origin of species is a problem which is still unsolved."

Professor Haldane is one of the most attractive of modern writers on science. I have a great respect not only for his intellectual gifts, but for his character. He has proved the sincerity of his religious devotion to science by a series of dangerous experiments on his own body. I should describe him as an irrational mystic, for his faith in the value of absolute Truth is mystical in its intensity and irrational in so far as he does not accept Theism, which his philosophy demands. It is a pity that his great gifts have been squandered on a dead and dying creed, for his powers of creative criticism might be employed with far greater effect if he ceased to concern himself with moribund Darwinism and turned his attention to something that is really alive—for example, to the greatest of modern movements, the rebirth of Catholic philosophy.

ARNOLD LUNN.

UNION BETWEEN THE ORTHODOX AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCHES

I

THE great religious and moral obligation under which we stand, to achieve something in the way of a greater degree of union between the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches, is clear to me. Not from abstract descriptions, but out of a living experience of the Anglican Church life, I know what great treasures this life contains, and what a great amount of spiritual unity between the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches already exists,

especially in the life of prayer and in the field of eucharistic experience. And then the still more central fact: That very strong concentration of Anglican religious thought—not the less in the present day—on the mystery and the riches of the INCARNATE LORD, and the trend of religious thought and feeling which deduces from this one central fact of the Incarnation the whole tenor of religious life, of individual and social activity, and the whole world-outlook—this cast of mind is truly patristical: yea, more—this is the real contents of the first preaching of the Apostles, and this is at the same time the central outlook of the Orthodox Church. In this deepest central understanding of the Christian Message we meet, we are one. The riches of the Incarnate Lord and the victory of the Risen One, as source of the Life Eternal, come into the world as leaven which has to permeate the whole of our life, as leaven which entered the history of mankind and the history of the cosmos: the Word which became flesh, sanctifying our life and our work and strife and endeavour, things interior and exterior, soul and body and matter, and beginning a new era for the whole creation, where death will be no more. And out of this central position, out of the mystery of the Word become flesh, springs this emphasis on social service, so characteristic of many of the best among the Anglicans; springs also the spirit of joyful victory so characteristic of the Orthodox Church—this Johannine cast of mind, this overflowing, active and triumphing contemplation of the glory and the victory of the Life Eternal. And from here springs also this moral earnestness, this eagerness of moral endeavour combined with the sacramental transfiguration of life, body and matter, culminating in the eucharistic experience of the community, and in the great experience of the stream of life—the life of the Holy Spirit, the stream of the living “tradition,” or, better to say, the living, dynamic life of the Spirit, rich and manifold, permeating the Church, forming the essence of the Church. This is common ground for us, here we are one: here we ought to become more and more one, to grow into ONE living organism. And the greatest stage we can take in that direction is to achieve intercommunion between our Churches: first, partial, individual intercommunion (in case of common eucharistic belief), then more and more large, and at last complete, intercommunion. I take the liberty to formulate here some hints referring to the official exterior side of this process of achieving more and more complete intercommunion between the two Churches.

II

HINTS AS TO THE WAY TO ACHIEVE INTERCOMMUNION
BETWEEN THE ANGLICAN AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES

1. The first step which ought to be taken is the recognition of the Anglican Orders by the Orthodox Churches. This has been already done by the Churches of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Cyprus, and Alexandria. There is no reason why the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches should not follow this example.

2. There is no necessity for scholastic definitions and over-definitions on both sides. They tend rather to disunite than to unite. There is, for instance, with some of the modern Greek theologians (not with all of them, of course) a certain tendency to heap definitions on definitions of rather recent provenance, and to consider them as binding—a tendency strongly contrary not only to the feeling of many Orthodox people, but to the whole spiritual habit and the general cast of mind of the Orthodox Church. This tendency ought not, therefore, to be allowed to prevail, or even to play a conspicuous rôle in the questions of union and intercommunion of the Christian Churches.

A general statement of accepting *the faith of the undivided Church* would suffice. The eucharistic doctrine is put forth clearly enough in the liturgies of the Orthodox Church and, e.g., in the Prayer of Humble Access of the Church of England. In regard to this great mystery of God, the “*lex orandi*” ought to be the “*lex credendi*.”

3. There are still some presuppositions for official intercommunion to be made, but these are mainly of *negative* character. There are some statements in the official or semi-official documents of the Church of England which can be easily understood as being in a certain contradiction to the above statements and present difficulties to the religious feeling of the Orthodox people. I mean, in the first instance, the Black Rubrick; further, the wording of Articles XXVIII. (first section, the words: “To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same”); XXV. (third section, the words: “of the *corrupt* following of the Apostles”); V. (“*and* the Son”; “through” instead of “and” could be acceptable), and to some extent also the wording of Articles XXXI., XXII., and XIX.; further, the use of the “Filioque” in the creed (which—not considering here the question of this theological statement—is regarded by the Orthodox Church as not lawful, being an addition to the Ecumenical Creed made by one half of the Christian world without the assent of the other half). It would be a great help to the union of the Churches if these difficulties could be overcome

in one way or another. It is especially the Black Rubrick which in its present wording presents difficulties to the religious feeling of the Orthodox people.

4. As long as these *negative* presuppositions mentioned in par. 3 cannot be achieved, a *complete* intercommunion would be difficult; but, given the essential identity of the faith and the very great amount of real spiritual unity and of unity of the eucharistic belief already existing, I think that, after the recognition of the Anglican Orders by the Orthodox Churches, *in a number of individual cases intercommunion could be allowed*, in cases of unity of eucharistic belief, under permission of the respective Bishops.

This step might prove most helpful in preparing a larger degree of intercommunion.

5. The benefits of intercommunion, where we on both sides achieve it in full consistency and perfect agreement with our religious conscience, and not in the way of diplomatical compromises, would be very great for both Churches. It would be a source of mutual edification, of mutual strengthening in spiritual life and spiritual warfare, and in the service of the Lord.

III

I add to these "hints" only a few words. Alongside with this, more exterior, "formula"-side, in the process of mutual understanding, there ought to be from both sides an ever stronger mutual growth into the depths of our common experience: into our common mystical life hidden and revealed in Christ the Incarnate, the Suffering and the Risen One—a being uplifted in common into the fulness of His riches, and being made sharers in common in His strife and His victory.

IV

NOTE ON SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

A question has been raised during the Lambeth meeting of the Joint Doctrinal Anglican-Orthodox Commission in October, 1931, as to the sufficiency for our salvation of that which is contained in Scripture—*i.e.*, whether there are religious truths necessary for our salvation which cannot be found in the Scriptures or deduced from Scripture, and much discussion has taken place on this subject.

I think the whole manner of putting this question is very much misleading. If we speak of what "is necessary for the normal functioning of Christian life," so, according to the belief of the Orthodox Church, there are things most important

and necessary for that purpose which are not contained in Scripture, but are given in the great stream of life of the Church, which is the life of the Holy Spirit permeating the Church.

On the other hand, in order *to be converted and to become a disciple* of Christ, not even all that is contained in the Scriptures, is explicitly required, but much less—just the prayer of the good thief: "Remember me, O Lord, when Thou comest in Thy Kingdom"; just the confession to Christ through the power of the Spirit of God; just the being "taken," "laid hold upon" by the Lord (Phil. iii. 12), and the baptism in the name of the Triune God. No one who is Christian would deny that the essentials of the Christian belief have been and can be summarized in very short words—*e.g.*, "I have decided to know nothing except Christ, and Him crucified"; or, "If Christ is not risen from the dead, then our preaching is in vain, and your faith is in vain also"; or, "The spirit of truth has to be discerned in the following way: every spirit who confesseth Jesus Christ come in flesh, is from God"; or, "Everyone who believeth in Him will not be put to shame"; or think of the creed and of the old baptismal formulas (beginning probably with 1 Cor. xv. 3-5). And, further, no one can deny that God may save persons who are not Christians and have no adequate knowledge of Him.

But this does not exclude the real point on which the Orthodox Church insists very strongly: that many things most necessary and important for the normal functioning of Christian life and most necessary for the life of the Church are not explicitly contained in Scripture. Therefore, the Orthodox Church, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, would not speak of the sufficiency of Scripture, but is rather opposed to such language. I have the impression that during the discussions at the Lambeth meeting of the Joint Doctrinal Commission, much has been said from both sides—and not least by myself—which was not quite to the point. The fault lies to a great extent with the rather inaccurate and misleading putting of the whole question.

We cannot define the limits of the saving Grace of God, but we can: (1) Summarize in few words the essentials, or even more—the *whole substance* of our faith (for in Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge [*cf.* Col. ii. 2], in Christ we have implicitly all the riches of God given to us [Eph. iii. 8]): if we really have Christ, we have all that is necessary; and (2) there are many sides and many manifestations of the life of the Holy Spirit in the whole of the Church, and many gifts of the Grace of God to the Church, which are not spoken of or are only implicitly hinted at in the Scriptures, but which are of greatest necessity for the normal functioning of the life of the Church and of the life of the individual Christian.

That is what is meant by the "tradition of the Church," by the living stream of tradition, the living stream of the life of the Spirit of God in the Church, which is more than Scripture, which is *not confined to Scripture alone*, of which Scripture is *only a part*, and in whose light alone the right meaning of Scripture can be understood. The life of the Holy Ghost living in the Church is *greater than Scripture*.

But, of course, this living stream of tradition or of life *cannot be in contradiction with Scripture*, and from this point of view it has always to be controlled by Scripture.

N. ARSENIEV.

SELAH

THERE was a place in that ill-fated city of El Amarna in Ancient Egypt (1370-1358 B.C.) called "the place of the records of the palace of the king." In it were stored the documents of the times, including the diplomatic correspondence.

The new city of El Amarna was deserted and destroyed shortly after the death of Akhenaten, its founder, and the silence of the desert once more closed over that mysterious place.

In the days of hasty destruction something had been forgotten; this was the contents of "the place of the records of the palace of the king." Perhaps someone remembered afterwards, but did not think it was worth while journeying from Thebes to the accursed place at El Amarna to bring back a few baked bricks.

Whatever be the reason, the records lay hidden there till our own times. These records are divided into two distinct classes:

(a) Royal letters—i.e., letters from foreign monarchs to the Pharaohs, two letters from Amenhetep III. to the king of Babylonia and the king of Arzarwa, and two from Amenhetep IV. (Akhenaten).

(b) Letters from vassal princes in Syria and Palestine to the Egyptian monarchs, etc., and letters from the king of Alasia (Cyprus).

The two classes of letters differ considerably. The style of the former class is distinctly better than that of the latter class. The sentences exhibit a better formation. They are longer, and the sequence of thought is maintained throughout the letters, showing no doubt that they were written according to some definite plan. These circumstances make them easier and more agreeable to read. The letters of the latter

class, including the letters from the king of Alasia, on the whole, are made up of short detached sentences. They are rugged in style, but perhaps they are more picturesque than the Royal letters, since they appear to have been written down at the mouth of the sender, and they lack that artificiality of style, which certainly appears in the letters of the other class.

There is, however, one exception. Abi Milki of Tyre, who addressed ten letters to Egypt, couches one of his letters in a style totally different from the rest of his correspondence. The style of this letter is artificial and highly poetic, until the last phrase is reached. This phrase he probably dictated himself.

These letters, which came from the provinces and Alasia, exhibit an important peculiarity. In them a certain word appears very frequently. This word is "Šanitu," and it is used to introduce phrases, where there seems to be somewhat of a break in the thought.

It may be translated "moreover" or "again," or in the sense of "in addition to what I have just said, then——"

The word appears in the Code of Khammurabi and elsewhere in Assyrian literature, having the meaning of "another" or "again."

Though "Šanitu" is usually translated "moreover" or "further," it is the opinion of the present writer, that the writers of the letters attached no special meaning to the word, but merely used it to piece together the somewhat broken sequence of their sentences.

Similar expressions, somewhat meaningless, are in constant use, in all modern languages, but they are not good style. They belong more to the sphere of conversation than to literature.

It has been noticed, earlier, that the word "Šanitu" occurs very frequently in the letters from the Syrian provinces, and from Cyprus, but it is most remarkable that the expression never appears in any of the Royal letters sent from Babylon, Assyria, Mitanni, or in the letters which were addressed by Egyptian monarchs, and which were found at El Amarna, apparently having never been dispatched.

In one of the letters from the provinces, written by Abi Milki of Tyre, a letter which is remarkable for its elevated style, the expression "Šanitu" does not appear until the final phrase, when it introduces a short and detached statement, which is expressed in that rugged style with which we are familiar.

Therefore, it would seem that "Šanitu" was a provincial expression, and not of the best style. It was really unnecessary to the sense, and it seemed to carry the meaning of "moreover."

The word "Šanitu" usually stands at the beginning of lines,

but there are occasions when it is found in the middle, or at the end of lines, but these cases are rare.

Whatever its position, however, the term always seems to be used in the same way.

In addition to the Royal letters, which were written at this time in Babylonian cuneiform, there is also another source of information. The great texts inscribed in hieroglyphics at El Amarna, belong to the same period. When these are examined a very important fact reveals itself. Just as the word "Šanitu" does not appear in the Royal letters, neither does any sign appear in the hieroglyphics, in the tombs, which might represent "Šanitu."

Although a certain amount of freedom of expression seems to have been allowed at El Amarna (so long as the expressions were orthodox), connecting words like "Šanitu" do not seem to have been employed, and only on very rare occasions is the word *hr* which is translated "also" found in use.

Now let us turn to the Psalter.

In several Psalms, there is to be found a curious word, about which many different opinions have been expressed. The word is "Selah."

It is suggested in the present work that the word should be approached from an entirely new angle.

To anyone who is acquainted with the Egyptian texts, especially those at El Amarna, it is perfectly clear that certain of the Psalms have a great deal in common with these texts. As to which are the originals, the question is not entered into here, but there is one very important feature which must not be overlooked. It is as follows: whenever it occurs, as it frequently does, that a text at El Amarna is found to be similar to a passage in the Psalter, *on no occasion* does *that* passage in Hebrew contain the word "Selah."

On the other hand, when we put aside the "Hymns of Praise" in the Psalter, and turn to what may be described as the "Complaint Psalms," we find that not only do these Psalms echo much of the thought, and indeed many of the expressions, to be found in the provincial letters, but these are the very Psalms which make use of the term "Selah."

In addition to this, the term "Selah" in the Psalms seems to have been used in just the same way as the term "Šanitu" is employed by the writers of these provincial letters.

The suggestion is put forward, that "*Selah*" *does not stand at the end* of a passage, as is usually assumed, but that it begins a new passage or a new phrase, or links two phrases together.

Sometimes the word appears at the end of a Psalm in Hebrew.

The explanation of this may be, that a fragment of the Psalm is missing. The LXX translators evidently regarded the position of the word at the conclusion of a Psalm so curious, that it is omitted in the Greek on those rare occasions when it stands at the conclusion in Hebrew. The term, therefore, is regarded as a connecting word, with the meaning somewhat the same as "Šanitu"—viz., "moreover."

"Šanitu" is apparently not a poetic expression, for it may be noticed that several of the writers quote what were obviously poems, but none of these quotations contain "Šanitu." After the quotation the narrative of the letter is introduced by the term.

It is not suggested that "Šanitu" is the Babylonian form of "Selah," but it seems very likely that the term "Selah" is an ancient word, which has a similar meaning, and is used in Hebrew, in the same way as the term "Šanitu."

A few examples will illustrate this:
Psalm iii.:

Many there be which say of my soul,
There is no help for him in his God.

Selah (moreover)

Thou, O Lord, art a shield about me.

I cry unto the Lord with my voice,
And he answereth me out of his holy hill.

Selah (moreover)

I laid me down and slept;
I awaked; for the Lord sustaineth me.

Psalm vii.:

Let the enemy pursue my soul, and overtake it;
Yea, let him tread my life down to the earth,
And lay my glory in the dust.

Selah (moreover)

Arise, O Lord, in thine anger,
Lift up thyself against the rage of mine adversaries.

Psalm xlv.:

In God we have made our boast all the day long,
And we will give thanks unto thy name for ever.

Selah (moreover)

But now thou hast cast us off, and brought us to dishonour;
And goest not forth with our hosts.

The example in Psalm xxiv. is very interesting, as it illustrates how that the term "Selah" connects two phrases which constitute a complete break in the thought.

The first six verses of the Psalm may be described as a

meditation on the question as to what manner of person is acceptable with God, and the passage concludes:

This is the generation of them that seek after him,
That seek thy face, (O God) of Jacob.

Then there occurs a complete break in the thought, and as we should expect, the new theme is introduced by "Selah" (moreover). So the Psalm continues:

Selah (moreover)
Lift up your heads, O ye gates;
And be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors:
And the King of Glory shall come in.

What, however, seems to be the most interesting example of all, is found in Psalm xxi.

The passage in Psalm xxi. 2 and 4 is parallel to a text at El Amarna.

Psalm xxi. 2:

Thou hast given him his heart's desire,
And hast not withholden the request of his lips.

Psalm xxi. 4:

He asked life of thee. Thou gavest it him;
Even length of days for ever and ever.

El Amarna—Tomb of Ay:

Thou hearkenest for him to all which is in his heart,
Thou lovest him and makest him like Aten.
When thou dawnest, eternity is given to him;
When thou settest, thou givest everlastingness.

The interesting feature of this passage in the Psalm is that, between verses 2 and 4, a passage has been inserted which is not found in the El Amarna text.

This passage is verse 3, and this verse seems to be a development of the idea contained in verse 2.

Since it appears to have been a later development, it is introduced, as we should expect, in a passage of this type, by the word "Selah."

Selah (moreover)
Thou preventest him with the blessings of goodness:
Thou settest a crown of fine gold upon his head.

Therefore, it is suggested that "Selah" is a connecting word, and that it is used to bind phrases together, or perhaps even to draw special attention to some statement which is suddenly introduced.

This theory has been tested in every passage where "Selah" occurs in the Psalter, and on every occasion it seems to improve the passage and to make the meaning clearer if treated according to this suggestion.

JOHN ROBERT TOWERS.

"TO HEAR HIS MOST HOLY WORD"

CONSIDERATIONS FOR CURATES

CONSTANTLY we are asked: "Why don't folk attend Church services as they used to do in 'the good old days'?" Those who ask this question seldom, if ever, put a definite date to, or give many details about, these "good old days." We are all apt to consider the difficulties of the "Desert" harder to put up with than the conditions in "Egypt" from which we have been delivered. Possibly a fuller knowledge of religious observations in the past and of their influence on common life may, at least, keep us from losing heart because we cannot put the clock back. The difficulties of the "Desert" compared with the "flesh pots of Egypt" indicated advance toward the "Promised Land."

It was because of the progress achieved that the children of Israel were in the "Desert." Our difficulties today in religion, even our "empty churches," may indicate advance on the past.

Present conditions may show us how we may make "Religion" the great "Reality" of every moment of our lives.

When we compare the "full churches" and the occupied "family pews" with the "social conditions" against which the great Lord Shaftesbury fought, and when we recollect that from at least 1662, daily in every church in the land, men were told to ask: "Grant that this day . . . *all* our doings may be ordered by *Thy* governance to do *always* that is righteous in *Thy* sight," we cannot but feel that things are not "worse" today than "in the good old days."

But, of course, things should be better today than they are. We cannot be content with our "empty churches," while our "Sunday cinemas" are packed.

I. WHY COME TO CHURCH ?

Many come to church "to get good." If they do not get something by their church attendance, they are bored, and in time stay away if the choir is bad, if the church is not comfortable, if the sermon is not right. And yet the most absorbing occupation should be church attendance if only we could make God the great "Reality." The old Prayer Book, in a wonderful very "short sermon," indicates the way to attain "Reality" in "worship."

I am not quite sure if the Prayer Book is as helpful as it might be to enable us to do in church what it so clearly sets before us.

But twice daily we are to be reminded, that we have come to our "Parish Church," which God has provided for the parishioners:

1. To render thanks for the great benefits we have received at God's hands.
3. To set forth His most worthy praise.
3. To hear His most holy Word.
4. To ask those things which are requisite and necessary, as well for the body as the soul.
5. To confess our manifold sins and wickedness with an humble, lowly, penitent, and obedient heart, to the end that we may obtain forgiveness of the same.

* * * * *

II. TO RENDER THANKS

Man is "dependent" upon God and upon his fellow-man for every need. "Every good gift and every perfect boon cometh from above, from the Father." Practically almost "every good gift" of the Father's is mediated to us through some human ministry. There is no such creature as "an independent gentleman." An American friend put it in a phrase: "When their dependents go on strike, the independent folk go without breakfast."

The saintly William Law has reminded us that the great "saint" is not the man who prays most, nor the man who fasts most, nor the man who gives most in alms; but the really great saint is the man who "gives thanks most." As a matter of fact, only the man who is grateful to God for His bounty and guidance, and to his fellow-men through whom that bounty reached him, can use aright the gifts bestowed on him.

We are "to assemble and meet together to render thanks

for the great benefits." Think how gratitude and the consequent joy on the first Armistice Day brought crowds together both in the streets and in the churches. Man is a social animal. In thanksgiving, especially as it has a manward as well as a Godward aspect, man instinctively seeks companionship. "Let us come before His presence with thanksgiving." "I was glad when they said unto me, *We will go into the house of the Lord.*" "To render thanks for the *great* benefits." Do we value "greatly" our "benefits"? Do we really consider that we have received "great" benefits from God and man?

Our empty churches are the result of our lack of appreciation of how many, and how great, are the "benefits" "poured" upon us.

"Blow, blow, thou winter wind,
Thou art not so unkind
As man's ingratitude. . . .

"Freeze, freeze, thou bitter sky,
Thou dost not bite so nigh
As benefits forgot."

Our "class war," our "clash of colour" problems, our imperfect and often warring international relationships are what they are because we have failed to "give thanks," not "only with our lips, but also in our lives," by giving up ourselves to "serve God and our neighbour."

"Gratitude" is an unselfish, joyous response to kindness. It must be expressed by lip and in life. "It is characteristic of gratitude that it links the recipient to his benefactor in the bonds of love, and the good-will in each case is mutual."

The following quotations from Dr. Hastings' great volumes on Religion and Ethics are worth noting:

"The place of gratitude among the emotions is a very important one, and its worth for human life and in the interests of religion is inestimable. It is but a phase of the solidarity of the race, on the one hand—'none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself' (Rom. xiv. 7); and, on the other hand, it is the basis of man's true relationship to God and to Jesus Christ. In the Christian Religion, it means not only the welling up of affection towards the Heavenly Father, but also the dedication of the believer to the service of the Divine: as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews puts it: 'Wherefore, receiving a kingdom which cannot be shaken, let us have gratitude [A.V. 'grace'; R.V.m. 'thankfulness'], whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God with reverence and awe' (Heb. xii. 28). This service of the Divine is the equivalent in religion of the good-will and readiness to benefit a benefactor in the sphere of the human" (vol. vi., p. 392).

Not until a man is "thankful" for "benefits received" can he set forth the praise of either God or man. "Praise is

not seemly in the mouth of a sinner." But a truly grateful man cannot long remain a "sinner." Part of his gratitude will take the form of repenting of his ungrateful disobedience in the past. Not until a man is learning to "give thanks" can he know for what things he should ask either for himself or for "all mankind."

The whole duty of man may be comprehended in "learning to say 'Ta' properly." In order to do this we call upon him—

III. "TO HEAR HIS MOST HOLY WORD"

Archbishop Trench taught us that

"When thou hast thanked thy God for every blessing sent,
What time will then remain for murmur or lament?"

At the most sacred act in the Holy Communion we are told to "*be thankful.*"

Nothing should manifest more clearly to us what cause we have for "rendering thanks," and how heinous is the sin of ingratitude, than God's "most holy Word." Our 1662 Book of Common Prayer presumes that folk will "press" into our churches "to hear the Word of God."

But do they so press?

If they do come to "hear His most holy Word," is the reading of the lessons at the Holy Communion Service and the daily offices treated either by the "Curates," the "Choirs," and the "Congregations," with the care and the training needed, so that the folk assembled may indeed "hear His most holy Word"?

Choirs have been known to pay no attention to the reading of the lessons; congregations do not always find the lessons grip them; nor does the listening-in to the voice of the reader reveal fresh meanings to the man in the pew. This may be partly due to his lack of meditating on the Bible at home. But, on the other hand, this lack of meditation may be due to the fact that the "Curate" does not "get across the footlights" with his reading aloud.

"Get across the footlights" is a phrase of the theatre; but the fact it seeks to express should be manifestly evident while the lessons are read in our churches. If this ideal is to be realized, the "parson," like the "poor player," must learn how to read aloud. This involves long training and much study and much prayer.

Let us imagine that an experienced scholar and actor is asked to read a play of Shakespeare's to the pupils of a secondary school.

What preparation will it be necessary for him to make in order to fulfil the task properly?

1. He must have learned to "breathe properly." This involves "breathing exercises."
2. He must have learned to articulate distinctly and easily. This again demands practice.
3. He must have learned by the right use of the "pause," by correct phrasing, by the right use of "light and shade," by the tones of his voice, to make the colour, the feeling, the meaning of subject-matter clear and interesting enough to hold the interested attention of all his hearers.
4. But, above all, he must be possessed by the play he is reading. He must get inside the words; he must read with sincerity and conviction.

The keen scholars who listen to such a reading, say of *Hamlet*, will be enticed to read for themselves; to discuss among themselves the actor's interpretation of the various characters. Such children will never vote that Shakespeare is dull.

All the qualifications needed for the proper reading of Shakespeare are needed for the proper reading of the lessons, and perhaps it is the reading of the lessons the 1662 Prayer Book has in mind when it bids us clergy—

"... read distinctly with an audible voice. . . . He that readeth so standing and turning himself, as he may best be heard of all such as are present."

In order that we may be not only "distinct" and "audible," but also sincere, spiritual, and convincing, we clergy pledge ourselves by a solemn vow:

"Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments?"

"Will you diligently read the same unto the people assembled in the Church where you will be appointed to serve?"

"It appertaineth to the Office of a deacon . . . to read holy Scriptures and Homilies in the Church."

Think how much better we might have read the daily lessons in our respective churches if we had not only been wisely trained in "elocution," but if, in addition, we had been more faithful to the pledge:

"Will you be diligent in Prayers, and in the reading of the holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?"

The would-be Bishop, as well as the would-be deacon and priest, is asked about the Bible:

"Will you faithfully exercise yourself in the same holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer, for the true understanding of the same?"

"To hear His most holy Word." The Prayer Book ideal is that not only should the clergy, especially such as were ministers in the congregation, by often reading and meditation in God's Word, be stirred up to godliness themselves, but "further, that the people (by daily hearing of the holy Scriptures read in the Church) may continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be more inflamed with the love of His true religion."

We read the Bible in order that we may realize "the great benefits we have received at His hand," and in order that we may, with ever increasingly thankful hearts, learn how we may in all things "truly please Him."

"Let him that readeth understand" what he is reading and the greatness of the task appointed him. Many of us older men may feel that we might have been more helpful to the cause of religion if we had studied and prayed so rightly that the poor as well as the learned would have been more regular, not to hear our parson preach, but to "hear" him read, as it should be read, "God's most holy Word."

"In the ancient Church the principle was always strictly adhered to that the reading of the Scriptures was for the congregation, and must therefore be intelligible. . . . It was understood that the whole congregation should follow the reading. Attention to the reading of Scripture is mentioned in an episcopal letter of the fourth century as the most important part of the Sunday regulations. The reading of Scripture was also expected to produce a direct effect upon the hearers. In a great number of records of conversions the crisis was reached while some passage of Scripture was being read in Divine service."—*Enc. Rel. and Eth.*, vol. ii., p. 603.

BERNARD M. HANCOCK.

TEMPERANCE OR TOTAL ABSTINENCE?

THE Teetotal Pledge was devised just a hundred years ago, so this is a convenient moment for an examination of the question of the Christian attitude towards the use of fermented beverages, especially as we have lately received a Report from yet another Licensing Commission. Now, it is common ground that fermented beverages are potentially dangerous, and that the abuse of them is to be condemned. Some think, however, that in this matter the abuse should take away the use, either because

use and abuse cannot easily be separated, or because the results of abuse are so grave and the results of right use so valueless that even a theoretical case for moderate use must be set aside. Indeed, what is called the Temperance Movement has been associated from its earliest days with a denial that moderate use is possible. Thus, the first newspaper articles on the subject (in the *Connecticut Observer* in 1826) had the title, "Total Abstinence as the Only Remedy for Intemperance," and in Wales, now the stronghold of so-called Temperance Reform, one of the earliest and most successful workers in the cause, Ieuan Gwynedd, declared that "there is no remedy against drunkenness except total abstinence," and that "moderate drinking only nurses the craving for drink, and the moderationist is on the high-road to drunkardom." This kind of language is still common amongst Temperance reformers. It may be questioned, however, whether the matter should be dismissed so summarily, and whether the assumption so often made, viz., that the moderate use of fermented beverages is less compatible with holiness than is total abstinence, should be allowed.

The Biblical evidence on the subject is, of course, of the highest importance for Christians, and it is, fortunately, quite clear. The story of the discovery of the use of fermented beverages perhaps reveals a prejudice against it. We are told that after the Flood Noah planted a vineyard, drank the wine, got drunk, and behaved himself in unseemly fashion. It is true that the story now ends with the information that Noah lived for a further 350 years (Gen. ix. 20-29), but as this story comes from J. and the note from P., we may perhaps argue that J. had a dislike of wine which P. did not share! The later association of the Rechabites with Judah may support this. They are mentioned only in Jer. xxxv. (c. 598 B.C.), but claimed descent from Jonadab the son of Rechab who lived under Jehu (c. 930 B.C.). Their tenets were: to drink no wine, to build no houses, to sow no seed nor plant a vineyard, but to dwell in tents. They represent a survival of the old nomadic life, perhaps partly out of sheer conservatism, partly out of contempt for the luxuries of civilization, partly out of fear of encouraging the cult of the Canaanite Baalim as gods of agricultural fertility. Thus their opposition to the use of wine was made, not because of the nature of wine itself, but because it was one element in a manner of life which they feared or disliked. It is illogical to take them as guides in this matter while refusing to follow them in their other prejudices.

The Nazirites, mentioned in Judges xiii. and xvi., Amos ii., Lam. iv. 7, and Num. vi., seem to represent a similar tendency.

They were people who separated themselves by a vow—either for a period or for life—to abstain from all fruit of the vine, from cutting the hair, and from contact with a dead body. This looks like the survival of primitive taboos. St. Luke records that John the Baptist was, by the angel's direction to his father, to drink no wine nor strong drink, and this is usually taken to be a reference to the Nazirite vow, which thus survived to N.T. times (*cf.* Acts xviii. 18, xxi. 23-24). Now, the taking of a special vow to abstain from wine implies a general permission to use wine, and in Israel wine was freely used by all except the Rechabites and Nazirites in pre-exilic times, even in religious observances (see 1 Sam. i. 24). Hosea, *e.g.*, laments that part of Israel's punishment will be that "they shall not pour out wine-offerings to the Lord" (ix. 4), while the Book of Deuteronomy, in making regulations about tithing, orders that a tithe of wine (amongst other things) should be brought to the sanctuary and there ceremonially consumed, and that if the distance to the sanctuary were a hardship, the produce should first be turned into money, the money taken to the sanctuary, and, says Deuteronomy, "thou shalt bestow the money for whatsoever thy soul desireth, for oxen, or for sheep, *or for wine, or for strong drink*, or for whatsoever thy soul asketh of thee; and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household" (xiv. 22-26). A trace of opposition is found in Ezekiel, who forbade the use of wine by priests "when they enter the inner court" (xliv. 21), and this became an accepted part of the priestly law (Lev. x. 9). Here again, however, the restriction implies a general permission to use wine outside the restricted sphere. That Israel's religious sense did not forbid the use of wine is shown by the fact that it was still offered in sacrifice (Exod. xxix. 40-41 P., Lev. xxiii. 13). We may note also that in Isa. xxv. 6 it is said of the coming Messianic Age, "In this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make unto all peoples a feast of fat things, a feast of wine on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined," where the word for "feast" is not the ordinary word for a religious festival, but means "a drinking," and the word for "wine" means wine that has matured by keeping, *i.e.*, fermented grape-juice. At the same time, drunkenness was sternly condemned by the prophets. In the Book of Proverbs we find further traces of opposition to the use of fermented beverages. Some of the passages usually quoted are perhaps directed against the abuse rather than against the use of wine. Thus,

"Wine is a mocker, strong drink a brawler;
And whosoever erreth thereby is not wise" (xx. 1);

and

"He that loveth pleasure shall be a poor man:
He that loveth wine and oil shall not be rich" (xxi. 17);

and

"Be not among the winebibbers;
Among gluttonous eaters of flesh:
For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty,
And drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags" (xxiii. 20-21),

are perhaps all condemnations of excess, not of any use of wine at all. An absolute condemnation, however, is found in xxiii. 31-32:

"Look not thou upon the wine when it is red,
When it giveth its colour in the cup,
When it goeth down smoothly:
At the last it biteth like a serpent,
And stingeth like an adder."

A limited opposition to its use appears in xxxi. 4-5:

"It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine,
Nor for princes to say, Where is strong drink?
Lest they drink and forget the law,
And pervert the judgment of any that is afflicted."

This is followed immediately, however, by the advice:

"Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish,
And wine unto the bitter of soul:
Let him drink, and forget his poverty,
And remember his misery no more."

A survey of the Old Testament evidence, then, shows clearly that throughout the whole period fermented beverages were freely used both privately and in public religious observances. Indeed, this latter was believed to have been commanded by God (see Exod. xxix. 40; Lev. xxiii. 13; Num. xv. 5, 10, xxviii. 7, 14). Moreover, the drink used was not unfermented grape-juice, but fermented and intoxicating liquor. This is shown, not only by the use of the word rendered "strong drink," but by passages like Jer. xlviii. 12; Job xxxii. 19; 1 Chron. xxvii. 27, as well as by the frequent references to drunkenness. The fact that this general use met with some opposition is particularly important because it shows that any line taken by our Lord in this matter must have had this opposition in mind. His attitude is therefore of the highest significance. We turn, then, to a study of the New Testament evidence.

As regards our Lord's own Ministry, the most obvious starting-point for a study of His teaching on this subject is the story of the changing of the water into wine at Cana in St. John ii., but here we are embarrassed by the difficulty that there is no agreement amongst scholars as to the historical trustworthiness of the Fourth Gospel, and there are special reasons for doubting this particular story. We may quote a recent writer, Dr. W. F. Howard: "The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation." He says, "There is something incongruous in the thought of displaying supernatural power to relieve the embarrassment of a host and to furnish an additional supply of wine to the wedding-guests who have exhausted the provision already made for their needs. In [this narrative] we seem to have a violation of principles which Jesus accepted as the outcome of the Temptation in the wilderness—that He would not make use of His reserve of power for personal ends or for coercing the minds of men into an attitude of belief in Him. It has sometimes been urged that, whereas exemption from the pains of natural want was contrary to the will of God, altruistic sympathy for the distress of others led to the miraculous creation of wine at Cana. The occasion, however, seems almost trivial for such a 'manifestation of His glory' that 'His disciples believed on Him.' Unless the Synoptic Gospels have misled us, the governing principle of Jesus was to arouse faith in Himself by spiritual appeal, not by overwhelming the reason of men. When a moral principle collides with a miracle we feel, by every Christian instinct, that it is the miracle that must go to the wall" (pp. 191-192). Dr. Howard's own suggestion is that the story had a natural origin. When the wine began to fail, the servants turned first to Mary and then to Jesus for advice, and Jesus told them to pour water into the diminishing supplies of wine. "The real miracle is that under the influence of Jesus, and stimulated by the royal wine of His heavenly discourse, their joy exceeded all the festal mirth of the earlier time, each guest rose above his ordinary level of thought and speech, his conversation sparkled with a brighter wit, and, when the feast was over, it was remarked that the best wine had been kept to the end." On this view, we might even suppose that Jesus was displaying an animus against wine by watering it! Against this, however, we may urge that if Jesus really disapproved of the use of wine, His disapproval would have shown itself by His abstinence from it at the feast, and He would not have been appealed to when the wine ran short. Even if, as some think, the story is an allegory, it shows that an early disciple thought that Jesus was one who approved the use of wine, and that the Church, which accepted his story, agreed

with him. At any rate, the Cana story must be interpreted in the light of other evidence.

After Jesus had called Levi from the receipt of custom, Levi made Him a great reception, to which he invited other tax-gatherers. It is not unlikely that the promptitude of Levi's response to the call indicates that he already knew a good deal about Jesus. If so, his arranging of this reception is all the more significant. But in any case, it is clear from the story, even if the kind of company had not made it probable, that wine was used. The Pharisees there and then attacked Jesus for eating and drinking with tax-gatherers and sinners, which they could hardly have done if He had sat there in frigid disapproval. He brushed their attack aside, but they returned to it with the question why His disciples ate and drank, whereas those of John fasted often. He replied, approving of the eating and drinking. St. Luke puts in the same context the parable of the wine and the wine-skins. This is worth quoting: "No man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the new wine will burst the skins, and itself will be spilled, and the skins will perish. But new wine must be put into fresh wine-skins. And no man having drunk old [wine] desireth new, for he saith, The old is good" (Luke v. 37-39). The point of the parable is that during the process of fermentation grape-juice gives off certain gases, so that if fresh grape-juice was stored in a fresh wine-skin, the skin would stretch as the gases expanded, whereas an old wine-skin which had lost its pliability would burst with the pressure. Job xxxii. 19 illustrates this, while Ps. cxix. 83, "For I am become like a bottle in the smoke; yet do I not forget thy statutes," evidently derives its point from the practice of hanging the wine-skin above the fire-place, presumably to assist the process of fermentation. As the bottle got blacker outside, the wine within would grow sweeter. Similarly, the saint's outward appearance showed the marks of the world's rough usage, but his spirit within grew sweeter in its response to the law of God. Thus Jesus was clearly thinking about fermented wine, not mere grape-juice. We allow that He was not really concerned about the correct method of storing grape-juice for fermentation, but could He have used such an illustration if He had thought all use of fermented beverages to be wrong?

Later on we find a saying which puts His own practice beyond doubt. He says to the Pharisees, "John the Baptist is come eating no bread nor *drinking wine*; and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man is come eating *and drinking*; and ye say, Behold, a gluttonous man, and a *wine-bibber*" (Luke vii. 33-34). Jesus drank wine (not unfermented grape-juice)

habitually. If this saying does not mean this, then language was never more deceitful.

We may notice one incidental reference. The Good Samaritan pours oil and wine into the injured man's wounds. We see how naturally and approvingly the use of wine occurred to our Lord's mind.

The most striking piece of evidence, however, is the Last Supper and the Institution of Holy Communion. Here Jesus went out of His way, so to speak, to enjoin the use of wine by His followers. He could just as easily have taken a cup of water and made this the sacramental species. Probably He took wine because it conveys readily the sacramental idea. Its colour, and the fact that it is the "life" of the grape, taken from it by violent action, help us to think of the sacramental wine as His Blood. But we can be quite sure that if He had believed wine to be harmful stuff and the use of it to be sinful, He would never have made it the sacramental species. We may note in passing that Holy Communion is a foretaste of the Messianic Banquet spoken of by Isaiah in a passage already quoted. We must insist, then, that the question should be decided in the light of the fact that Jesus Himself drank fermented beverages and commanded His followers to do so. An attempt is sometimes made to turn the force of this consideration by dwelling on the alleged fact that it is rarely safe to drink water in Eastern countries, so that wine was used as a beverage for this reason. This contention will not stand a moment's examination. The Bible contains numerous references to the drinking of water. Jesus Himself spoke with appreciation of those who would give a cup of water to His disciples (Mark ix. 41), and the story of the woman of Samaria, even if not historical, is significant in this connection (John iv. 4-14). We may remark, too, that Mohammedans, who refuse to drink wine, occupy those countries without being killed off by the drinking-water.

Another attempted way of escape from the implications of Christ's attitude towards the use of fermented beverages is to stress the fact that modern science has revealed more clearly than in the time of Christ the harmful effects of alcohol upon the human body, and it is suggested that if Jesus had had this modern knowledge He would have joined the ranks of the total abstainers. Now, apart from the fact that this question is by no means one upon which modern science has passed a final and unfavourable verdict, we urge that for the making of a practical decision Jesus was equipped with sufficient knowledge. We have shown that before His time there had developed amongst His countrymen a certain amount of opposition to the prevailing view that fermented beverages may be used in moderation, and

as a moral Teacher He must have adopted His own practice after thought on the subject. Moreover, as a user of wine Himself He had experimental knowledge of its effects, and it is certain that He also had ample opportunity of observing its effects upon others. Modern science can measure more accurately than He could such things as blood-pressure, respiration, and reflex motor action, but it is not necessary to be able to measure these things before one can form a sound moral judgment on our question. Jesus knew as well as we do the abuses to which the use of fermented beverages can be made to lead, yet He did not decide that this was a matter in which abuse should take away the use. Whether the maxim, *Abusus non tollit usum*, should be applied or not is often a question that calls for nice discrimination. We can hardly do better than be guided by Jesus in this particular case.

We are very far from arguing that Jesus would have countenanced the evils that are associated with the drink traffic today. It is noticeable that His own contacts with the use of fermented beverages occur in connection with social meals. Probably we may safely infer that He valued wine for the part it can play in promoting healthy relaxation and good-fellowship. There is nothing to suggest that He would approve of what the Chinaman called "Drinkee for drunkee," or indeed of anything more than the strictly social use of this amenity. At the same time, we need not be stampeded by these abuses into abandoning the right and beneficial use which Jesus favoured.

The earliest followers of Jesus were in an even better position than we are to know His mind on a matter of this kind, so we turn now to the rest of the New Testament evidence to see whether it supports or conflicts with the conclusions to which we have so far come.

In his Pentecostal sermon St. Peter rebuts the charge that the disciples were drunk, not by indignantly denying that Christians would have anything to do with fermented beverages, but by saying that it was too early in the day for a man to be drunk.

In 1 Cor. xi. 21-22 St. Paul reproves the Corinthian Christians because when they came together it was not possible for them to eat the Lord's Supper. "Each one of you," he says, "taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken." But he is condemning, not the use, but the abuse, of fermented beverages, for he adds, "What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" Here was an excellent opportunity for him to forbid outright the use of fermented beverages had he believed it to be wrong. He did not do so because, like his Master, he believed their use to be right.

Exactly the same thing comes out incidentally in Rom. xiv. The whole chapter is concerned with such questions as that "One man hath faith to eat all things: but he that is weak eateth herbs." St. Paul is anxious lest stronger Christians, by insisting on their liberty, should cause weaker Christians to stumble, and he urges that the prejudices of the weak should be respected: "Overthrow not for meat's sake the work of God. All things indeed are clean; howbeit it is evil for that man who eateth with offence. It is good not to eat flesh, *nor to drink wine*, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth" (Rom. xiv. 20-21). St. Paul, we see, is clear that Christians may drink wine. The stuff is not itself a concoction of the Devil's. His other point, however, will bear discussion. We may paraphrase his problem thus: "One man has faith to drink all things—for all things indeed are clean; but he that is weak drinketh water." Ought the prejudices of the weaker brethren to deprive the rest of that which they may properly enjoy?

To begin with, we note that an affirmative answer would compel us all to be vegetarians, non-smokers, and many other "nons." We have no right to press part of the argument unless we are prepared to admit also the other part. Again, St. Paul was offering advice in what he believed to be a temporary difficulty. He was not reckoning on the fact that we should have the weaker brethren always with us. The "strong" Christians have another and higher duty towards their weaker brethren, viz., to educate them out of their prejudices; to show them, for example, that fermented beverages can be used without being abused. Further, St. Paul's advice has a certain appeal, and perhaps still has a limited application. But, as we have already seen, Jesus knew about the prejudices of the weaker brethren on this matter, and He ignored them. The disciple is not above his Master. To follow the disciple's advice here would be to condemn the practice of the Master.

In three passages St. Paul condemns drunkenness (Eph. v. 18, Rom. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 21). Now, to exhort a man not to get drunk is intelligible if you grant that he may drink, but not otherwise. A man who is opposed to all gambling does not exhort people not to gamble for high stakes; he urges them not to gamble at all.

Thus all along we find St. Paul taking for granted Christian liberty to use fermented beverages in moderation. His only doubt is whether this liberty should be exercised if it makes a weak brother to stumble.

We take separately the interesting passages in the Pastoral Epistles because of the possibility that they are by a different author. In 1 Tim. iii. 3 and Titus i. 7, one of the desiderata for

a bishop is that he should not be *πάποινος*. The word is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. What does it mean? The renderings of the English versions are as follows:

A.V.: "Not given to wine."

A.V. marg.: "Not ready to quarrel and offer wrong, as one in wine."

R.V.: "No brawler."

R.V. marg.: "Not quarrelsome over wine."

It will be noticed that the first of these practically means a total abstainer, while the other renderings are ambiguous. Liddell and Scott, however, say that the cognate verb *παποινέω* means "to behave ill at wine," "to play drunken tricks," "to act like a drunken man," "to treat with drunken violence"; the nouns *παποίνημα* and *παποινία* mean "a drunkard's jest," and "drunken behaviour" respectively; the adjective *παποινικός* means "addicted to wine," "drunken"; and the adjectives *παποίνιος* and *πάποινος* have the same meaning as *παποινικός*. In the above passages, therefore, the rendering "no drunkard" would be an exact equivalent of the Greek. That the writer does not mean that a bishop must be a total abstainer is shown:

- (a) By the fact that five verses later he says that deacons must be "not given to much wine," which implies that they may take a moderate quantity.
- (b) By the fact that later on he recommends Timothy to take a little wine for his stomach's sake and his frequent infirmities. Probably Timothy had followed St. Paul's advice to abstain from wine for the sake of the weaker brethren, and is now advised that another motive warrants the resumption of his Christian liberty.

The only other New Testament evidence bearing on the question is Rev. vi. 6, where in a Vision the Seer hears a heavenly voice saying, "A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny. And the oil and the wine hurt thou not." Whatever this means, it certainly betrays no hostility to wine.

Thus the New Testament evidence, from our Lord to the end, all points in one direction: Christians must avoid drunkenness, but otherwise are quite free to use fermented beverages, and in fact are ordered to do so in the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood. We are led irresistibly to the conclusion that, if to be a good Christian is to follow Christ as closely as we can, then it is impossible to be at once a good Christian and a total abstainer.

It is, of course, equally impossible to be at once a good Christian and a drunkard.

It is a confirmation of this position that the Catholic Church, while always condemning drunkenness (though refusing to regard it as the worst of sins; *e.g.*, it is not explicitly mentioned in the Litany or Catechism), has never condemned the use of fermented beverages. The Teetotal Movement only began, as an offshoot from a slightly earlier Temperance movement, about a century ago. It began as a Nonconformist movement and has remained predominantly Nonconformist ever since. It is surely odd that we had to wait until the nineteenth century to discover that the Church's Lord, the writers of her sacred Scriptures, and the whole Church until then, had been wrong about this matter. More probably it is the total abstainers who are wrong.

A. E. MORRIS.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AMONG contributors to the present issue Professor Cock, of University College, Southampton, is well known to our readers as a student and exponent of von Hügel, and Mr. Arnold Lunn is also a frequent contributor to these pages. The Rev. A. E. Morris is Professor at St. David's College, Lampeter; and Professor Arseniev is Lecturer for Russian religious life and Russian language at the University of Königsberg and Professor of Orthodox Theology at the University of Warsaw. The Rev. B. M. Hancock is Rector of Monksilver, Taunton; and the Rev. J. R. Towers is Vicar of Buxworth, Stockport, and on the staff of the University of Manchester.

We have received from Messrs. William Clowes and Sons, Ltd., a copy of a pamphlet entitled "The Modern 'Hymns A. and M.': An Answer to Certain Criticisms." The pamphlet contains a reprint of some remarks of our own and of Dr. Lowther Clarke's which appeared in *Theology* last May; and we are glad to see the claims of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* so well and so moderately stated. Copies of the pamphlet will be sent gratis to anyone interested.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Zeitschrift für die N.T. liche Wissenschaft. 1932. Heft I.

The chief feature is Prof. Windisch's article on the Epiphany of Christ to St. Paul outside Damascus. This is surprisingly like the legend of Heliodorus in 2 Macc. iii. Heliodorus is sent to rob the Temple. He is overpowered by a heavenly apparition, falls to the ground and becomes speechless; he has an intercessor in Onias and experiences a second vision, in which he is commanded to proclaim God's power to all, especially the king (cf. Acts xxii. 17 ff.). In both stories the vision is of an offended heavenly power, who punishes. Windisch does not claim that Acts is in any way derivative, but that the details of the story are filled in by the writer from traditional motives, which are most fully exemplified in the Heliodorus-legend. There are also striking parallels with the *Bacchæ* of Euripides, which is a drama of a typical *θεομάχος*; note that *θεομάχος* occurs only once in the N.T., in Acts v. 39, and that the proverbial saying "kick against the pricks" comes from the *Bacchæ*—there is no point in the plural in Acts, but the metre demands it in the play. The motive of the Acts story is in no sense psychological, only punitive.

W. K. L. C.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

The July number opens with an able survey of Roman schools in the second century by Father Bardy. He patiently pursues the obscure and troubled annals of these schools, and skilfully pieces the facts together. He draws attention to the private ones, notably that of St. Justin, but during the third century the bishops gradually gained control.

Father Cottlaux continues his survey of the corruption of theology entertained by Abelard, particularly noting the effects of Platonism. Father Cerfaux comments upon Bultmann's history of the synoptic traditions, combining with it a lively defence of ordinary tradition. Father Frochisse studies the origins of the fasting before Eucharist. He begins with Tertullian and comes down to the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. He holds that the traditional opinion, which reports its beginning in the third century, is not founded upon history. He adduces evidence to show that this practice dates from the second half of the fourth century, and is a custom of the Church in 400.

R. H. M.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. XXIII., No. 1.

Professor Solomon L. Skoss gives the text and translations of David ben Abraham al-Fāsi on *Permutations in Hebrew* (a common practice in the Old Testament, of which the English reader may see an instance in Judg. xxii. 6). This grammarian flourished in the second half of the tenth century. Professor Skoss provides a careful introduction, references to the text and notes to the translation.

Professor Solomon Zeitlin contributes a valuable article on *The Am Haarez*. The term *Am haarez*, "The people of the land," is found frequently in the Old Testament with varying meanings—e.g., (1) the people as distinguished from the king and the aristocracy (Jer. i. 18; Ezek. vii. 27; etc.); (2) the poorest of the people (2 Kings xxv. 14); (3) the non-Israelite population (Gen. xxiii. 7, 12, 13); (4) the half-heathen, half-Jewish population (Ezra ix. 1, 2, Nehemiah x. 20, etc.). In St. John vii. 49, what is evidently its Greek equivalent is used as a term of contempt: ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον ἐπάρατοί εἰσι. Modern scholars generally, and perhaps too readily, conclude that the term *Am haarez* as found in Rabbinic literature is used always in this contemptuous sense. "No boorish man fears to sin," said Hillel, "nor is the *Am haarez* pious" (*Pirke Aboth*, ii. 6).

Professor Zeitlin thinks the word was originally used to describe the farming class. These tillers of the soil through lack of opportunity became less cultured than town-dwellers and ignorant of Jewish ritual customs, and thus in later periods the term *Am haarez* became synonymous with ignorance. He is probably right in seeing a reference to a socialistic tendency among the despised labouring class in the saying "'Mine is thine and thine is mine' is *Am haarez*; 'Mine and thine' is pious; 'Thine and mine are mine' is wicked" (*Pirke Aboth*, v. 17).

Zeitlin quotes, as referring to Jewish Christians *Tractate Berakoth*, fol. 47b: "Who is an *Am haarez*? Whoever does not read the *Shema* evening and morning. . . . Whoever does not put on phylacteries." But such passages may as well apply to Jews who have never been taught or who have forgotten to observe such customs.

Zeitlin concludes with a useful warning. The term *Am haarez*, found frequently in Rabbinic literature, is to be interpreted in various ways. Only from internal evidence of the text where the term occurs can we get at the real meaning and know to what particular class of people it refers.

R. D. M.

REVIEWS

THE ELEMENTS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By F. P. Harton.
S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

Fr. Harton has written an important book. It is the first Anglican manual of Ascetic Theology since Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living*. Incidentally it reveals how far we have advanced since then in our understanding of the spiritual life. *Holy Living* begins with the excellency of man as the peak of creation, and with his need of responding to the goodness of God. The emphasis is on human effort. Fr. Harton lays the emphasis on the action of God. He stresses the supernatural character of the Christian life as a life "hid with Christ in God." Again, Jeremy Taylor, in dealing with prayer, like his contemporaries envisaged only one kind of prayer, vocal prayer, though he recognized its five parts. Fr. Harton sketches admirably the development of the prayer life from its initial stages up to the threshold of mystical experience. It is like emerging from an inland lake on to the Atlantic Ocean.

The book is an answer to a long-felt want, and is itself a sign of the vitality of the Anglican Church. It possesses a refreshing freedom from undue systematization and rigidity, while at the same time its teaching is everywhere definite and orthodox. Moreover, Fr. Harton takes cognizance of modern knowledge and shows no fear of it. Questions of psychology inevitably come to the fore in his subject, and he is ready to use the results of modern psychological research without being in the least dominated by them. They do not, for instance, hinder him from insisting quite emphatically upon the existence of a personal Devil. Possibly he might have made more use of them than he has, but he is wholly at one with the psychologists in stressing the positive side of things, the aiming at virtues rather than the crushing of passions as the best way of overcoming temptation. There is none of that almost morbid harping on renunciation which appears in some ascetic writings.

That does not mean that the subject of mortification is shirked or its need minimized. The chapters on it are particularly valuable and particularly needed by us today. The author joins here with all the saints in insisting on the necessity of mortification of some kind, if there is to be any progress in the spiritual life. And it must be real. Yet he also vindicates the function of pleasure and accords it its proper place in the soul's development.

The section on prayer is also written with understanding.

The author threads his way skilfully through its intricacies and gives much valuable instruction. The chapter on contemplative prayer is particularly important. He is puzzled in treating of the Three Ways because St. John of the Cross "appears to place the night of sense at the beginning of the Illuminative Way." But is this not due to the fact that the whole process of the Three Ways seems to repeat itself later on a higher level? So St. John of the Cross begins, as it were, where others leave off. And is not this an additional reason why all attempts to place living souls in categories are so precarious?

Fr. Harton's book forms a landmark. It is a book for every priest to study, specially if he lacks time, or library, for larger works: and it is a book, too, from which our educated laity can learn much, and above all a wider vision of the spiritual life. But it will need supplementing. Fr. Bede Frost's *Art of Mental Prayer* already does this on one side. Others, no doubt, will follow. Yet there is real value in trying to cover so large and important a subject in one small volume. It blazes the trail, as it were, and also shows the spiritual life in its due proportions.

One would like to put forth two or three points for the author's consideration for future editions. The chapter on the guidance of souls is too short to be of much value. Was it necessary in so small a book to give an account of all seven sacraments? The passage on intercession and the idea behind it are difficult to follow. One Ignatian method of mental prayer gets perhaps a disproportionately large place, whilst the other very valuable methods taught by St. Ignatius are not mentioned at all. The Sulpician method, on the other hand, is given scarcely a page, and it is much less familiar. By the way, one misses in the Bibliography Letourneau's *La Méthode d'Oraison Mentale*—probably the best exposition of the Sulpician method. (It may be out of print.) Contemplation does not always accompany the Unitive Way, here at any rate, and it would be well to make this quite clear.

Many would find the Bibliography more useful arranged according to subjects than according to dates. In choosing a work on ascetics, we should like first to know whether it is a book of instruction on the whole spiritual life or mainly on prayer, or whether it is just meditative. For instance, Walter Hilton's *Scale of Perfection* and Fr. Baker's *Holy Wisdom* are as much "handbooks" as more modern works—and more valuable as such.

One thing more we hope for—a book on this subject written with something of the leisureliness and conviction of the old masters, combining inspiration with instruction. Nowadays

we keep all the time half an eye on controversialists, and we are always pressed for space and time, and such things rob us of the right kind of "unction."

HUBERT NORTHCOTT, C.R.

ST. PHILIP NERI AND THE ROMAN SOCIETY OF HIS TIMES. By Louis Ponnelle and Louis Bordet. Translated by R. F. Kerr. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

Hitherto the saint of Counter-Reformation Rome has been ill served by his biographers. His uneventful life has been smothered in emphasis upon a number of peculiar personal characteristics, and in a mass of miracles, also peculiar rather than edifying, the fruit of that uncritical admiration which sees wonders in the simplest coincidences, and half invents even the coincidence. An essentially modern saint has been draped in the dress of an earlier credulity, and it has not fitted at all. It has been the more irritating, because the whole Church needs the witness and encouragement of the modern saint so badly; and clearly, behind the oddities and wonders, there must be a man of God of extraordinary devotion and charm: one of those blessed persons like the Curé d'Ars and Father Stanton, who are themselves the miracle, carrying about with them an almost palpable presence of God, and stirring the souls they meet to the depths.

Now, for the first time, we have a biography, critical and based on most thorough research, the whole intention and effect of which is to make us see the man as he was, and his surroundings as they were. The task was not easy. St. Philip's life is outwardly almost without event other than his personal relation to disciples and contemporaries: and the Rome of his day stranger and more difficult to represent than that of the earlier medieval epoch. As founder of a new congregation, he must surely be the most negative that ever existed; his whole effort in regard to it seems to have been one of limiting its activities and of personal withdrawal. The picture given of Roman society, from popes to laymen, is oddly different from our imagination of a militant headquarters of Counter-Reformation; conflict is absent from a parochial cure in a city where Catholicism is taken for granted. For Philip's contribution to the European battle was that of the local pastor who loved souls with a consuming fire. Again, he left scarcely anything in the way of writings which can illustrate his spirit or feed the devotion of posterity.

In their task, though we owe a great debt to the authors, we do not think they have altogether succeeded. As chroniclers

their work is admirable, even massive, except for a lack of clarity as to when, at what date or stage, this or that took place. So the chronicle, though complete, is confused. No student of St. Philip will be able to neglect it, or do anything but base his studies upon it; it becomes at once authoritative. Yet it is not easy to read, even to a lover of St. Philip or to one specially interested in the foundation of the Oratory (the reviewer is both). This is not due to the style; the translator has done his work well. Biography asks for more gifts than history; and though the authors have made Philip a human being, they have not communicated to us his exceptional personality. He is swamped by his disciples, who, in turn, even the greatest of them, Tarugi, Bordini, Talpa, do not live; some pages indeed become lists of names, as deadening as those of the Book of Ezra. To depict spiritual character as Fr. Martindale, Fr. Mackay or Sabatier can depict it, requires gifts other than historical; and our authors scarcely possess them. At one splendid moment they approach it, when, on the last page of the book, they quote the fifty-four ejaculatory prayers which Philip taught Francesco Zazzara to say over and over again. These indeed are "still vibrating with his love." In his prayer, we see and love his soul.

Similarly, although the foundation and character of the Oratory are described at length, and in all its details are interesting, the reader is left with mind somewhat confused and unilluminated. That may be in itself true and valuable historical witness, reflecting contemporary opinion about the new society. For Counter-Reformation Rome, like England of the Catholic revival, had a fixed and fast idea of what constituted a religious community. That which involved departure from the recognized types of early and medieval monasticism was found inexplicable to the Church as a whole, and indefinable by its own authors. Only the Jesuits proved an exception, so comprehensible was the simplicity of their stress on obedience, and so vivid their fighting service of the Church. But new days bring new needs, whether in sixteenth-century Italy or twentieth-century England; and though the Oratory came into being merely to conduct a new type of popular devotion and instruction, its real inspiration was St. Philip himself, and its real meaning the association of secular priests in a loose and free society for particular work done with particular standards of priestly love and fellowship. In opposition to all existing communities, it was bewilderingly democratic. St. Philip's ideal of ruling was to withdraw from ruling altogether: even to discountenance any extension of his own principles! The autocracy of the superior gave place to the influence of such as deserved it. In his lifetime, his own influence sufficed, whether

he spoke or not; for his mind was known. It has indeed sufficed since his death—greatest of tributes to his saintliness. But as an institution, the Oratory was difficult to understand, and seemed to have no principle of stability and survival. Philip himself—another proof of his greatness—regarded such a weakness as a merit, since it ensured the continuance or ending of his foundation simply according to the highest spiritual test, the mind of God. He was right; not only does the Oratory survive, but at any moment it may be called under new circumstances to its original particular work, the reformation or inspiration of secular priesthood. So it happened in France of the seventeenth century and England of the nineteenth.

A great interest of the book—and here a certain lack of proportion and confusion does not matter—lies in the glimpse it affords of Rome at the period of its reformation. For the saint's story has little to do with popes and cardinals, and leaves wholly on one side ecclesiastical policies; it runs in the humbler places, and shows how souls were converted and came back to the Church. It is, in fact, the narrative of a Mission. The society it describes is strangely different from anything with which we are familiar: to an Anglican it suggests, in particular, that the "titles" and "cures" of the Roman clergy proceeded on a most haphazard and unordered system; and that there is, or was, more actual regimentation in Anglican ministerial disposition than in Roman.

We cannot be too grateful for the labour and research which has given us the first good life of St. Philip Neri: if the finer gifts of biography do not go hand in hand with the handling of immense masses of historical material, we can leave that to essayists of the future. They will have to begin by mastering this book.

E. MILNER-WHITE.

MYSTICISM EAST AND WEST. A Comparative Analysis of the Nature of Mysticism. By Rudolf Otto. Macmillan and Co. 16s.

This book is described in the sub-title as a comparative analysis of the nature of mysticism, and the author tells us that in it he "attempts to penetrate the nature of that strange spiritual phenomenon which we call mysticism by comparing the two principal classic types of Eastern and Western mystical experience. By means of this comparison, and by explaining the individual features of one type by those of the other, the nature of mysticism itself becomes gradually more comprehensible." There are two questions which must be answered affirmatively before this claim can be substantiated.

First, is Western mysticism independent of Eastern? Professor Otto treats East and West as two separate entities and springs a surprise on us when he shows conclusively that, in spite of the separateness of Sankara and Eckhart, their fundamental teachings are not merely similar but identical. It is true that Western mysticism is fundamentally Platonic, but it is also true that Neo-Platonism contains a large admixture of Eastern doctrine. Philostratus, for instance, asserts that the Indians "taught the naked sages of Egypt," and claims Indian influence upon Greek thought from Pythagoras onwards, stating further that the Alexandrian doctrine of God "originally belonged to the Indians." The teaching of pseudo-Dionysius owes much to the East, while the existence of Averroism points to a closer mediæval contact between East and West than is commonly recognized. Eckhart himself owes much to Averroes and probably to other Eastern teachers. In view of these considerations it seems impossible to maintain the intellectual independence of East and West.

Secondly, are Sankara and Eckhart really representative of Eastern and Western mysticism? Sankara is important as the forerunner of the advaitism of Ramakrishna and Vivekananda, but there are other equally classic schools of Indian mysticism which differ considerably from him. Eckhart may be claimed as the spiritual father of Boehme and Swedenborg and (so Professor Otto would seem to say) of Luther, Fichte and Schleiermacher, but does he therefore represent the principal classic type of Western mystical experience? Western mysticism is essentially Christian; Harnack goes further, and says, "It will never be possible to make Mysticism Protestant without flying in the face of history and Catholicism," while Miss Evelyn Underhill remarks that "The greatest mystics have not been heretics but Catholic saints." Now much of Eckhart's teaching is undeniably Christian and common to Western mysticism in general, but in certain essential doctrines, in which he is at one with Sankara, he not only outstrips Dionysian speculation but cuts at the root not only of Catholicism but of Christianity. We may instance his opposition of Deitas to Deus, his doctrine of the identity of the soul with God, his foundation of salvation upon knowledge and his indifference to morality, the last of which is not touched upon in this book. In these and other doctrines Eckhart stands outside Catholic mysticism and is not followed even by Tauler and Suso; he can indeed only be regarded as representative of Western mysticism if we agree with our author in ignoring Catholic mysticism and sanctity and regard "the West" as simply Lutheran and "Gothic."

We would maintain that the nature of mysticism as a whole can only be penetrated by a study of all its main types, not by an investigation, however thorough, of the teaching of two mystics who happen to be respectively Eastern and Western and represent, as Professor Otto himself admits, "a special type of mysticism to be distinguished from other mysticisms."

As a study of the doctrine of Sankara and Eckhart, apart from more general considerations, this book is extremely valuable and interesting. Professor Otto has a wide and deep understanding of Indian mysticism, and his exposition of Sankara is most illuminating; he also gives a clear and learned account of Eckhart; but when he notices other forms of Western mysticism, which is seldom, he makes some singularly wild statements—for instance, one is surprised to learn that *Caritas* is "sentimental" and that voluntaristic mysticism is merely "intoxicated eroticism." Part A, which deals with the common doctrine of Sankara and Eckhart, is balanced and learned and gives the reader much food for thought, as also does the transition chapter; the same may also be said on the whole of part B, which deals with their differences; but the author's desire to represent Eckhart as a good Lutheran and "Gothic Man," and to suggest the general superiority of the Lutheran and Gothic point of view, suggests, in places, the propagandist rather than the scholar.

The most striking fact which emerges from the study of these two great speculative mystics is not that they differ, which we should expect them to do, but that their differences are so relatively superficial. In their fundamental doctrine the Indian and the German, the Hindu and the Christian, are not merely related, they are identical, so that Professor Otto can assert with truth that "with a little skill it would be possible so to weigh up and present their fundamental teachings that the words of the one would read like a translation into Latin or German from the Sanskrit of the other and *vice versa*."

The usefulness of the book is impaired by the fact that it possesses no index, and it is, in our opinion, more expensive than it should be, even in these days of costly production.

Congratulations must be offered to the translators, who have discharged a difficult task with complete success.

F. P. HARTON.

NOTICES

JUDAISM IN THE GREEK PERIOD (333-63 B.C.). The Clarendon Bible. Old Testament. Vol. V. By G. H. Box. The Clarendon Press. 4s. 6d.

It is a great pleasure to receive another book from Canon Box, especially when it is perhaps the most useful short book on the Bible published for some years. The plan is to write a description of Judaism "between the Testaments," as older scholars used to say, and then to give a commentary on select passages from parts of the Old Testament and Apocrypha which are generally accepted as belonging to the period. This gives us the Wisdom literature, some Psalms, Daniel, Maccabees, etc.; also Joel, Zechariah ix.-xiv., Canticles, Isaiah xxiii., Jonah, and Habakkuk, interpreted from the standpoint of those who put them in the period; Habakkuk, that is, on the assumption that Alexander is referred to.

The book may be a little bewildering for boys and girls at school, but as an authoritative summary of the three and a half centuries which preceded the coming of Christ for older readers it is invaluable.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

INNER LIGHT. A Devotional Anthology. Allen and Unwin. 5s.

This Devotional Anthology is the work of devout members of the Society of Friends. As a fellow-Anthologist I must keep true to the principle that "dog does not eat dog," and also beware of revealing any esoteric knowledge I have of the secrets of our craft. I can at least suggest the stumbling-block which causes wrong and unfair criticisms; it is just that each Anthology is not recognized by the critic to be addressed to a special audience. Every Anthology caters for its own set; the art has its Lyons as well as its Ritz, and the Anthology succeeds just in so far as it suits the mental outlook of those for whom it is intended. Critics who ignore this do not know their Aristotle.

Inner Light seems to have in view quietistic readers, devout enough to enjoy noble passages from Scripture, unsophisticated enough to greet such news as "Nature is the garment of God" as a discovery, and catholic enough to pass readily from George Fox to Ignatius Loyola. The collectors may have made mistakes sometimes in giving what their readers will not appreciate; if so, their mistakes will fall on their own heads—their book will be a failure. But I do not think they will miss their mark; their book will certainly be useful to the souls for whom it is intended. No Anthologist who has a mark to aim at in any sense at all, could hope for more.

W. J. FERRAR.

CHURCH AND GNOSIS. By Professor F. C. Burkitt. Cambridge University Press. 6s.

This book embodies last year's Morse Lectures. Professor Burkitt puts his subject at once in touch with living interests by suggesting that the emergence of *Gnosis* was due to the need of replacing *konsequente*

Eschatologie, when the expectation of the end of the age began to fail. He sees a like change of ground effected in Catholicism by means of St. Paul's doctrine of Christ's Mystical Body, in which He fulfils the *ὑστέρημα* of His redemptive suffering. Thus is the delayed end of the age explained.

If there were really so radical a change of ground, following such an opportune discovery, we might have expected it to leave more obvious marks. Professor Burkitt agrees (p. 15) that "the thought of the coming Parusia did not fill St. Paul's mind at any time," and (p. 57) that it was alien to Greek thought. He does not discuss difficulties, and the suggestion is left in tentative form. Professor Burkitt proceeds, in two delightful chapters, to analyze some Gnostic systems. Their ingredients are found to be, apart from some sort of Christian gospel (which Professor Burkitt holds always to be the motivating factor), Ptolemaic astrology, *σῶμα-σῆμα* psychology, and the principles of "white" magic. The systems themselves range from the thinly mythicized philosophy of Valentinus to phantasy-constructions full of scraps from Oriental sources. The latter type predominates, because, in the long run, saving pass-words which carry the soul through the spheres at death were of more account than present illumination. We can trace unacknowledged debts to various mythologies. Professor Burkitt invites us to see Rhadamanthus and Jehovah turned to account as Aberamenthou and Jeû! These chapters pave the way for what is the outstanding contribution of the book, a chapter in which the Mandæans are shown to be a sect of Marcionite Gnostics, persecuted into formal denial of Christianity. The argument must be read at length. It bids fair to end the curious vogue these folk have had.

Finally, Professor Burkitt shows that the Catholic Church, in resting its *praxis* less on theology than on historical scriptures—the records of what God has done—escaped the fate of *Gnosis*, which perished along with the scientific theory which it embraced. Professor Burkitt has imparted wonderful freshness to unpromising themes.

W. TELFER.

THE PARSON'S HANDBOOK. By Percy Dearmer. Twelfth edition, with 35 illustrations. Humphrey Milford. 10s.

Few will agree with the opening sentence of the Preface to this twelfth edition of the *Parson's Handbook*. It is because "a consistent Anglican use is" by no means "now established and understood in every part of the world" that the labours of such scholars as Professor Dearmer are valuable. Full tribute must be paid to the learning of the author, and his industry in providing such a multitude of directions, and so impressive an array of quotations from ancient sources, in support of the standpoint which is apparently one of the dominant motives of his book.

This particular standpoint, which may be described as a dislike of all post-Reformation Roman Catholic contributions to liturgical development, must be recognized from the start, if the reader of the *Handbook* is to judge to what extent its recommendations can wisely be followed.

No serious student would support the incorporation into Anglican Services of actions which are meaningless apart from Roman worship. But to stretch this principle too far is, in effect, to deny that any Roman

Catholic innovation of the last four hundred years is commendable for its own sake and apart from its context.

The lack of wise guidance in ceremonial reform by the bishops of the nineteenth century led many clergy to refer to Roman textbooks for information. Many mistakes which perforce resulted from such a habit are now being gradually rectified. But a number of reforms introduced during that unfortunate period are justifiable by their intrinsic reasonableness, and are far too strongly entrenched to be removed.

For instance, a stiff pall is clearly more convenient than a second loosely folded corporal. Anglican clergy will not eschew the former solely because its use began in Roman Catholic churches. Similarly, short surplices with short sleeves and a neat square opening at the neck are of practical utility in churches in industrial districts, where even the air is dirty, and large bills for washing are financially impossible. They are less apt to be soiled by the hands and creased by the knees than the loose voluminous surplices so dear to the author. To suggest that their use is analogous to wearing a bathing costume at a cricket match (p. 127) is in very questionable taste, and will not effect their removal.

Again, it is too late to criticize the placing of four or six candles on a re-table or gradine behind an altar of Byzantine or Renaissance type, seeing that such beautiful shrines as Delhi Cathedral and Eton College Chapel are witnesses to their effectiveness. The frequent occurrence of such examples of an obviously one-sided outlook tends to create a distrust of the book as a whole.

The directions regarding the Service of Holy Communion fill four long chapters, and do not give the clear and straightforward guidance which the majority of the clergy need so much. In many cases suggestions are made apparently with the sole object of discouraging simple common-sense practices which today have won the approval of clergy and laity in cathedrals and churches of quite different types. The reason for the author's preferences need not be repeated, but it may be urged that the repeated intrusion of a controversial spirit, however delicately expressed, will not assist in healing the wounds in Christ's Body, the Church; nor will educated opinion readily admit that adjuncts and accompaniments of worship which appeal to millions of Christians, of every country and racial type, can be summarily rejected as wanting in taste.

To sum up, the clergy would be well advised to retain their earlier editions of the *Handbook*, as being more reliable guides than the edition under review.

H. SPENCE.

MARRIAGE. From the French of Raoul Plus, S.J. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

This little work, which presents the Catholic conception of marriage in a naïve and attractive manner, is essentially a book for the "converted." In the first part Fr. Plus deals fully with the rights and duties of marriage, and with its unity and indissolubility. In the second, he treats of preparation for marriage remote and proximate, and stresses the need for pre-nuptial chastity, and for mutual understanding between engaged couples as to the duties of the married state. Perhaps he is most helpful in his advice on "choosing a partner." There is much in the book which should clear the Roman Church from accusations of prudery made against her in certain quarters. Speaking for instance, on the

subject of the rights of married people with regard to their thoughts, Fr. Plus quotes with approval the words of another Catholic writer: "Thoughts, imaginations, desires, and words concerned with relations that are permissible in marriage, are not sinful in married people." In another place he says himself: "Any familiarity serving to prepare for, or to complete the marriage act . . . is allowed." One passage seems to call for special comment. Needless to say, Fr. Plus utterly condemns the use of contraceptives. But, acknowledging that marriage has a secondary purpose beyond procreation, he says, "In cases where continence is being observed (because the birth of a child is not desirable), married persons have the right—and the duty—of showing each other marks of affection even intimate and prolonged . . . those only excepted which are intended to achieve complete sexual satisfaction." Surely for most couples such demonstrations would be impossible; or, if possible, would be condemned by expert medical opinion on the same grounds as American "petting parties," or a well-known "natural" method of contraception.

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

1. CONSCIENCE. By Romano Guardini. Sheed and Ward. 3s. 6d.
2. WHAT IS MEANT BY PIETY. By the Rev. J. Brodie Brosnan, M.A., O.B.E. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.
3. THE VIRTUE OF TRUST. Meditations. By Paul de Jaegher, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 8s. 6d.

Conscience and *What is Meant by Piety* form a curious contrast. The former is, if nothing else, up-to-date; the latter might, except for a sneer at "scientists who falsely contend that all humans are descended from a monkey," have been written in the middle ages.

The author of *Conscience* is one of the leaders of the Catholic Youth Movement in Germany. Young Roman Catholics in the Fatherland, no less than young Lutherans and young atheists, in the turbulent period immediately following the war, came to the conclusion that their elders had grossly mismanaged world-affairs, and that men and women under twenty-five could and would arrange everything much better. The movement was naturally one of revolt. The Roman Catholic Church, which has always stood for law and order, was of course anxious that it should not become one of indiscriminate rebellion. Very wisely, a Youth Movement within the Church was organized. It was not necessary for a boy or girl to turn Protestant or unbeliever if he or she wished to be a Wandervogel or to set the world to rights.

But alas! the New Jerusalem has not been built in Germany any more than in England; and Dr. Guardini is sad at heart when he sees his young enthusiasts grown forty and disillusioned. He trembles lest they should lose their faith. He speaks to them earnestly, in tones at once friendly and grave. He reminds them that "we live in an ethical Babel," and pleads for the recognition of the stern voice of Conscience which alone will direct us aright.

The book is notably non-Roman in spirit. The author's first pages read more like a chapter from Professor Moore's *Principia Ethica* than a Catholic work of piety. The development of the theme proceeds on Protestant lines. The significance of Conscience is declared to be absolute. Warnings against the warping of Conscience are given. We are to beware

of superficiality and frivolity; we are not to be "scrupulous"; we are to disregard our personal bias and judge all things as "before God."

The final chapter, "Conscience and Recollection," is the best in the book, and may be recommended to any devout follower of God, to whatever Church he belongs.

Though written in a hard and unattractive style, the book deserves to be read for its sincerity and courage.

A quotation from *What is Meant by Piety* will best explain its nature. Strange that in this busy world, where practical problems press every moment for solution, there should still be found a man with time and inclination to compose such a work! Will any readers have time or inclination to peruse it? One fears that such labour must, like virtue, be its own reward.

"Supernatural man has no hypostatic union with the Second Person, nor with Christ. Sanctifying grace is not the medium of the hypostatic union in Christ himself; were it so, the hypostatic union would not be an immediate union; the union would be accidental and involve two persons in Christ—all heretical and absurd conclusions. It follows, then, that supernatural life is not a hypostatic union either with Christ or with Christ's own theandric life."

The book affects me as the Cambridge colleges affected an American friend of ours. "Say," he remarked, "don't you find these old buildings vurry depressing?"

It is a relief to turn to the last book on our list, *The Virtue of Trust*. The author is a Jesuit, writing from India. The volume is dedicated "To trust's great heroine, the beloved S. Teresa of the Child Jesus." I know nothing more of him, and he would probably wish that nothing more should be known, for every page in the book breathes that humility which is the mark of authentic saintliness. Here is a man who knows the Mystic Way. Here is a man who understands both the weakness of human nature and the strength of God, and who, therefore, can speak to our condition.

Pere de Jaegher's writing is not conspicuous for erudition or for intellectuality, but for the knowledge of holiness. We feel as if we had stepped into a church where the architecture is not particularly arresting, and where there is no preacher speaking an eloquent discourse, but where the light shines before the altar and companies of invisible spirits compel us to kneel and adore.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE MAKING OF EUROPE: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF EUROPEAN UNITY. By Christopher Dawson. Sheed and Ward. 15s.

"Je n'impose rien; j'expose." Such was the impudent boast with which Lytton Strachey prefaced his lively study of *The Victorians*, every line of which was inspired by his intention, conscious or unconscious, to impose upon the reader his own Voltairian attitude to life and to religion. Every writer of history must of necessity impose his own philosophy on his public, and if his philosophy is unsound, as was the case with Strachey, the result will be bad history.

Readers of THEOLOGY will probably agree that Mr. Dawson's philosophy is in essence true, and he therefore starts with one great advantage

over Mr. Lytton Strachey in his interpretation of the past. Moreover, he brings to his task the necessary equipment of knowledge and wide reading. He wears his learning lightly, and his attractive style helps us to forget that every page of this book represents a verdict which is the outcome of detailed and laborious research. I have a prejudice against superlatives, but I will risk the assertion that Mr. Dawson's book is by far the most important contribution to a difficult and critical period of European history that has so far appeared.

The book is an attempt to synthesize that confused and troubled period, the Dark Ages. It is divided into three parts, of which the first deals with the foundations of modern Europe, the Roman Empire, the Catholic Church, and the barbarian invasion; the second with the ascendancy of the East; and the third with the formation of modern Christendom. I cannot hope to summarize the argument within the limits of my allotted space. I can only tempt the reader to secure this book by assuring him that there is hardly a page that does not contain some stimulating thought, and that is not pregnant with challenge to accepted historical judgment.

Here is one illustration out of the hundreds that might be selected. St. Jerome's attack on pagan literature is familiar to all students of the early Fathers, and it is often quoted as an example of the hostility of Christianity to classical culture. But the true significance of the episode, as Mr. Dawson is, I think, the first to point out, lies in the fact that "Jerome's devotion to classical literature was so intense that it had become a spiritual temptation." But if I once start quoting, I shall never stop.

Mr. Dawson regards the Dark Ages as an age of gestation from which emerged the unity of European civilization, a unity which was the product of the Roman Empire, the Catholic Church, the classical tradition, and the barbarian invasions. The main thesis of his book, which, like all books, Mr. Strachey's included, has a thesis, is that modern historians are wrong in emphasizing nationalistic separatism at the expense of European unity, and the humanistic tradition of the Renaissance at the expense of the supernatural tradition of the Catholic Church. It is only, so Mr. Dawson contends, by realizing the unity underlying national rivalries and the influence of supernatural beliefs on secular civilization that we shall begin to understand our own historic pedigree.

In one small point I was disappointed with this book. I turned to the singularly complete bibliography in the hope of finding some reference to Mr. Byron's very stimulating book, *The Byzantine Achievement*, but the book is not mentioned. Mr. Byron is fiercely anti-Roman and passionately pro-Byzantine. I hope that one day Mr. Dawson will read his book, and will discuss and criticize his conclusions.

ARNOLD LUNN.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. G. G. Coulton, Litt.D. Faith Press. 7s. 6d.

We should commend this book to those who have enjoyed reading Dom Butler's fascinating work on the Vatican Council, and, in fact, to all who are interested in present-day Ultramontaniam. It is good that Dr. Coulton reminds us of certain glaring defects in the character of the Council itself, in particular of the fact that suitable representation, both as regards population and learning, left so much to be desired. The complaint of the Minority at the Council, quoted on page 128, "that culture

in their Church was being outvoted by multitudinous ignorance" seems to have been amply justified. In regard to the Minority, Dom Butler contends throughout that at least the bulk of them only resisted the proposed Definition on inopportunist grounds. This argument comes in for severe criticism, in support of which Dr. Coulton quotes, among others, extracts from the unspoken speech of Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis (pp. 174-193). Passages such as these justify the conclusion that a considerable section of the bishops, and those by no means inconsiderable intellectually, opposed the Definition, not because they felt it to be inopportune, but because they believed it to be untrue.

The use made of the contention that Papal Infallibility alone can give real security is so familiar that it seems worth while to ask how the power to settle questions infallibly works out in practice. To this enquiry Papal apologists give very uncertain answers. One might expect that, if the "ex cathedra" criterion is worth having, we ought to know fairly well where we stand. But that is precisely what the Infallibilist writers do not appear to know themselves. Not only do startling discrepancies exist between the lists of infallible decisions which they supply, but it is even possible for a document like the Syllabus of Pius IX. to be regarded as infallible in one century, only to find its infallibility denied by the next. "The phrase 'ex cathedra' has been recently invented to paper over the cracks" (p. 58). It is perhaps a pity the paper seems so thin.

TREVOR JALLAND.

BUTLER'S LIVES OF THE SAINTS. Vol. VII. July. H. Thurston and D. Attwater. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

The first volume of this new edition of Butler's Lives appeared in 1926. To those who value the opportunity of possessing a "short but readable and trustworthy account of the principal saints, who are either venerated liturgically in the Western Church, or whose names for one reason or another are generally familiar to Catholics of English speech," it will be welcome news that the process of publication is to be hastened by the co-operation of Mr. Donald Attwater with Fr. Thurston, the original editor.

There is a good deal in the present volume to commend it to Anglican readers. Sometimes one meets with frankness which in a Roman Catholic author may seem a little surprising; for example, the statement among the notes on St. Mary Magdalen's Day (p. 315) that "it is impossible to allow any sort of probability to the view which venerates the Sainte Baume as the home of her last years." The legend of St. Veronica meets with some fairly open criticism, and it may astonish some to read that the station commemorating the incident "was omitted at Vienne as late as 1799" (p. 155).

We are specially glad to find John Keble's rendering of the Eastern Vespers Hymn, *ὡς ἱλαρόν*, quoted with approval as a "fine English Version." The many types of saintliness unfolded by a work of this sort are the best possible illustration of the truth of Dr. Karl Adam's words in his *Spirit of Catholicism*: "The One Spirit of Jesus, their Head and Mediator, is manifested in his Saints in all the rich variety of their individual lives, and according to the various measure, in which every single soul with its own special gifts and its own special call has received and employed the Grace of God."

TREVOR JALLAND.

DIE HEILIGE SCHRIFT DES A.T. ÜBERSETZT UND ERKLÄRT. *Die Klage-
lieder* (Paffrath); *Das Buch Baruch* (Edmund Kalt). Bonn:
Peter Hanstein. M. 3.40; gebunden, 4.70.

Ekhah (or "Lamentations" falsely so called) labours under two handicaps with Christian readers: the writer(s) cannot get past the idea of the lawfulness of the spirit of revenge and of God being the direct cause of all evil. Yet it is one of the noblest books of the O.T., and, within its small bulk, there is much precious and abiding gold. Dr. Paffrath has a due sense of the beauty and of the religious value of Lamentations. He is not interested merely in their poetic structure. As regards "Criticism," the writer has comparatively few references to textual emendations: he passes over without comment the strange deficiency of LXX at iii. 23, 24, and purely linguistic notes are not common. His exegesis follows sound lines. "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold and see . . ." (i. 12-22) is the cry of Jerusalem to the nations (cf. ver. 18, "all ye peoples"). In iv. 20, "the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the LORD," is "Zedekiah, as the last king, with whose fall the theocratic kingdom itself must fall to pieces." And yet Dr. Paffrath cannot break from tradition and point the (to us) inevitable moral that he who wrote such sympathetic words as Lam. iv. 20 cannot have been the prophet who recognized more than anyone that Zedekiah was the greatest enemy of Judah. On page 10 the writer hurriedly considers arguments against the Jeremian authorship of Lamentations, but his defence (largely mere reference to earlier conservative opinions) is hardly worthy.

Edmund Kalt, as a "Catholic" editor, assigns "at least chs. i. 1-iii. 8 to Baruch the Prophet," though he naïvely admits that "the Protestant expositor rejects the authenticity of the entire book." He finds "22 citations from Jeremiah, but none from exilic or post-exilic books" (pp. 4, 5). This may be so, if the traditionally accepted authorship of (e.g.) Daniel ix. 12, 13 (cited in Baruch ii. 1, 2) is allowed to stand. Kalt claims that though Baruch was already absent from the Hebrew Bible known to Jerome, as it finds a place in LXX and is cited by later writers, it is canonical. "The original [of Baruch proper] was written in the Hebrew language," and the editor is inclined to accept Naumann's view that the Epistle of Jeremy existed originally in a Semitic language. It appears that Kalt was unable to take advantage of Thackeray's work in the same field.

R. S. CRIPPS.

THE REFORMATION AND THE IRISH EPISCOPATE. By Hugh Jackson Lawlor, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. S.P.C.K. 1s.

This is a revision of a pamphlet published in 1906 by the Church Historical Society, to show that the present bishops of the Church of Ireland, and not the bishops of the Roman Communion in Ireland, are the canonical successors of the medieval Irish bishops and the rightful possessors of their sees.

It is not addressed to Roman Catholics, who of course hold that those who deny the Papal Supremacy and the decrees of Trent have no right to the possession of any Catholic see: but it is intended to meet the argument sometimes heard in England, that the Church of Ireland is merely an Anglican mission Church in Ireland, and not the ancient Church of the country. Even if this argument were true, the Church of Ireland would still have the right to the adherence of all Anglican Churchmen in Ireland.

But Dr. Lawlor shows that it is false: that the bishops of the Church of Ireland represent the Irish bishops of Mary's reign, while the Romanist bishops are the successors of titular bishops who were "provided" by the Pope in opposition to the bishops elected by the chapters, and most of whom never saw Ireland: and that on the death of Queen Mary the bishops then in canonical possession of the Irish sees publicly and formally accepted the Elizabethan settlement, all except two, Walsh of Meath and Leverous of Kildare. These were the only two Irish bishops who were deprived of their sees. It is said that the people at first followed their bishops, until they were perverted by the missions from the Continent (and, we must add, by the greed, treachery, and cruelty of the English invaders).

C. B. MOSS.

A NEW SHORT GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT. By Prof. A. T. Robertson, D.D., assisted by A. Hersey Davis, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

This volume, containing nearly 500 pages, printed at New York and published in London, forms a connecting link between the original *Short Grammar* issued many years ago, and Prof. Robertson's massive volume, *A Grammar of the Greek N.T. in the Light of Historical Research*, a third edition of which was issued in 1919. The present Grammar is no mere re-issue of the earlier book: it has been completely rewritten for its present purpose—namely, to furnish an introduction to the larger work. Unlike most Grammars, it can almost be read with pleasure as well as profit, especially in the sections devoted to Syntax. One reason is that a large, indeed a preponderating, number of illustrative examples are given not merely in Greek but in English. Nor do the writers content themselves with just registering facts; they explain idiom and usage. Take, for instance, the remarks on *iva*, which has other uses than finality; on the history of the Infinitive and Participle; or on the uses of the Article. A careful study of the sections that deal with these and similar points will enable a student to obtain a genuine grasp of the intricacies and delicacies of Greek idiom. The notes on the Aorist—"the normal tense to use in Greek unless there is some special reason to use another"—are quite illuminating. Most helpful, though brief, are the chapters devoted (1) to the Greek ancestry of the *κοινή*, (2) its special characteristics, and (3) certain outstanding features of the Greek N.T., embodying (as these do) traces of Semitism—not anything like so many as was formerly believed—Latin influences, and so on. The final chapter of the book deals with Figures of Speech; it is perhaps the least adequate of all the chapters, but useful enough as far as it goes; students, however, who are on the look out for fuller treatment will have to refer to Blass as well as to Robertson's larger Grammar. The final section of this chapter (§ 475) consists of a note on the "Grammar of Ungrammar" in the Apocalypse, but it seems to be of little value: some reference surely should have been made to the late Archdeacon Charles' invaluable pages on the grammar of "Revelation" in his important commentary on the most difficult book in the whole Canon. A book like the present Grammar would be shorn of most of its usefulness if it lacked proper indexes; so we may remark that the two indexes here provided answer every reasonable demand. Altogether, we are most favourably impressed by this volume, on which much care and thought have evidently been expended.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

ANGELUS SILESII. Selections from *The Cherubinic Wanderer*. Translated with an Introduction by J. E. Crawford Fitch. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

The name of "Angelus Silesius" is familiar to English students of mysticism, but it is fitted to no clear personality and calls up no definite image. Mr. Crawford Fitch has done well to relate something of the interesting life of Johann Scheffler, sometime Court Physician to the Lutheran Duke Sylvius Nimrod of Würtemberg-Oels.

The boy was born at Breslau in 1624 of an old father and a young mother. He was sent to the local grammar school, where he learned not only to write Latin verse but to compose poetry in the German tongue. After a year spent in studying law and medicine at Strassburg, he proceeded to Leyden.

Holland at that time was alive with strange sects—Anabaptists, Mennonites, Collegiants. The works of Böhme had just been published, and were exciting men with hopes of penetrating celestial mysteries. Something of Böhme's love of luminous obscurity can clearly be discerned in Scheffler's later poetry.

At that time, however, the young man was still chiefly concerned with medicine. He journeyed as far as Padua, and took the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and Medicine. Then, highly qualified, he received his lucrative appointment as Court Physician, and also carried on a private practice of his own.

A close friendship with a mystic and Cabalist, Abraham von Frankenberg, turned Scheffler's thought again towards the arcana of religion. When Frankenberg died, the physician published a mystical poem in his honour.

Later he collected an anthology from those authors whose spiritual works they had studied together. The book, however, was censored by the orthodox Lutheran Christoph Freytag, and an *imprimatur* refused.

The effect was immediate. Scheffler left Oels, returned to his native Breslau, and plunged into the study of Catholic apologetics. Then, to the amazement of his friends, he was received into the Catholic Church, taking the name of Angelus. If he had contented himself with writing mystical works within the Catholic fold, it would have been well enough. Unfortunately his restless spirit could not satisfy itself with speculation or even with religious experience. He became in later life one of the bitterest opponents of Lutheranism, a militant champion of the Counter-Reformation.

Mr. Crawford Fitch is troubled by the unreconciled contradictions in his hero's nature, and wishes that he could have presented him to us not only as an interesting and vivid personality but as a saint deserving whole-hearted admiration.

As for the poetry of Angelus Silesius, it is, we must admit, less arresting than the life of the man who wrote it. It must not be read in cold blood, nor judged by ordinary poetic standards; for the words used are not descriptive but symbolic, and are meaningless to those who have had no experience of the states of mind alluded to. The states of mind are curiously non-Christian. Many of the verses read like the composition of Hindu or Sufi mystics. How did they manage to slip past the Catholic censor?

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.